

APPENDIX
TO THE
THIRD REPORT
OF THE
COMMITTEE.
MINUTES OF EVIDENCE,
26th June—17th September, 1913.
WITH APPENDICES.

First Report of the Committee is printed separately as [Cd. 6828].

Appendix to the First Report of the Committee, 1 vol., is printed separately as [Cd. 6829].

Second Report of the Committee is printed separately as [Cd. 7228].

Appendix to the Second Report of the Committee is printed separately as [Cd. 7229].

Third Report of the Committee is printed separately as [Cd. 7479].

Final Report of the Committee is printed separately as [Cd. 7235].

Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of His Majesty.



LONDON:
PRINTED UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE
BY A. THOM AND CO., LTD., 87, 88, AND 89, ABNEY STREET, DUBLIN.

To be purchased, either directly or through any Bookseller, from
E. PONSOMBY, LTD., 118, GRAFTON STREET, DUBLIN; or
WYMAN AND SONS, LTD., 29, BEAUMONT BUILDINGS, FETTER LANE, E.C.4, and
28, ABINGDON STREET, S.W., and 54, ST. MARY STREET, CARDIFF; or
H.M. STATIONERY OFFICE (SCOTCH BRANCH), 23 FORTH STREET, EDINBURGH;
or from the Agencies in the British Colonies and Dependencies,
the United States of America, the Continent of Europe and Abroad of
T. FISHER UNWIN, LONDON, W.C.

1914.

Price 3s. 11d.

[Cd. 7480.]

Vice-Regal Committee of Inquiry into Primary Education (Ireland), 1913.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	Page
LIST OF WITNESSES	i
MINUTES OF EVIDENCE	1
APPENDICES	349
INDEX	496

LIST OF WITNESSES.

—	Date on which Evidence was taken	Name.	Designation	Question.	Page.
Thirty-third Day.	26th June, 1913	The Very Rev. Isaac Coulter, D.D.*	Dean of Kilmore	14624-14760	1
Do.	do.	The Rev. K. D. Crowe, M.A.*	Rector of Cavan	14722-14934	4
Do.	do.	Mr. C. B. Todd	Principal, Ballymacarrett Road N.S., Belfast.	14925-15194	11
Thirty-fourth Day.	27th June, 1913	do.	do.	15490-15700	23
Do.	do.	Mr. W. C. Boyd	Principal, Ravenscroft N.S., Belfast.	15701-16046	24
Thirty-fifth Day.	10th July, 1913	Mr. J. L. Robertson, M.A., LL.D.	S.M. School Chief Inspector, Scotland.	15967-16420	41
Thirty-sixth Day.	16th July, 1913	Mr. T. B. McHugh, B.A.	Principal, Holden N.S., Limerick	16431-16625	58
Do.	do.	Mr. J. E. Lawrence	Principal, St. James's N.S., Belfast.	16640-16833	65
Thirty-seventh Day.	17th July, 1913	Mr. D. HENNE, B.A.	Treasurer, Irish National Teachers' Organisation.	16834-17389	78
Thirty-eighth Day.	18th July, 1913	Mr. H. E. Carter, B.A.	Principal, Omeau Road N.S., Belfast.	17390-17586	95
Do.	do.	Mr. T. Cahill	Principal, Tyneweigh N.S., Drogheda, Co. Down.	17600-17707	101
Do.	do.	Mr. J. Smyth, B.A., B.Sc.	Principal, Nicholas Memorial N.S., Limerick.	17708-17890	106
Thirty-ninth Day.	20th July, 1913	Mr. T. Jackson, B.A.	Principal, Michael Street N.S., Belfast.	17891-18059	115
Do.	do.	Mr. W. Anderson	Principal, Danvers N.S., Co. Down.	18066-18317	123
Fortieth Day.	21st July, 1913	Mr. J. A. Craig	Principal, Sydenham N.S., Belfast.	18318-18577	129
Do.	do.	Mr. E. Crowe	Principal, Liscroft N.S., Galway, Co. Limerick.	18578-18995	134
Do.	do.	Mr. H. O'Gorman, B.A.	Principal, Kilmacsk N.S.	18996-19046	143
Forty-first Day.	24th July, 1913	Mr. M. O'Mahony	Principal, Molloy N.S.	19047-19158	152
Do.	do.	Mr. P. Owens, B.A.	Late Principal, Roscrea N.S.	19159-19310	157
Do.	do.	Mr. P. J. Fogarty	Principal, Gartagowna N.S.	19311-19452	162
Do.	do.	Mr. E. Geary	Principal, Rathgorman N.S.	19453-19578	166

* Representatives of the Kilmore Diocesan Association of School Managers of the Church of Ireland

LIST OF WITNESSES—continued.

—	Date on which Evidence was taken.	Name.	Designation.	Question.	Page.
Forty-second Day.	25th July, 1913	Miss M. A. Sweeney	Principal, Maryke N.S.	19479-19738	179
Do.	do.	Mr. M. O'Donnell	Asst. Teacher, Monard Boys' N.S.	19739-19804	173
Do.	do.	Mr. M. O'Grady	Principal, Templeme N.S.	19835-19983	178
Do.	do.	Mr. M. O'Flanagan	Principal, Kilkenny N.S.	19984-20076	182
Forty-third Day.	26th July, 1913	Mr. T. Keegan	Principal, Rosgreen N.S., Clonsilla	20077-20204	185
Do.	do.	Mr. J. B. Nash	Principal, Templeme N.S.	20235-20331	190
Do.	do.	Mr. R. Quinn	Principal, Rathkevin N.S., Clonsilla	20332-20436	193
Do.	do.	Mr. P. Barry	Principal, Mervinagh N.S.	20437-20503	194
Do.	do.	Mr. P. Leahy	Principal, Glengrove N.S.	20504-20637	195
Forty-fourth Day.	30th July, 1913	Mr. D. C. Maher, B.A.	Principal, Ardara N.S., Clonsilla	20638-20787	199
Do.	do.	Mr. G. O'Callaghan	Principal, Mahonagh N.S., Newcastle West.	20788-20887	215
Do.	do.	Mr. G. Kearney	Principal, Orlow N.S., Clonsilla	20888-21035	217
Do.	do.	Mr. M. Landon	Principal, Rosington N.S.	21036-21113	225
Forty-fifth Day.	2nd September, 1913	Mr. E. Mansfield	Secretary, Irish National Teachers' Organisation	21114-21307	217
Forty-sixth Day.	3rd September, 1913	do.	do.	21308-21330	214
Forty-seventh Day.	4th September, 1913	Mr. C. MacCarthy	Principal, Anghrim N.S., Clonsilla	21331-22338	215
Forty-eighth Day.	5th September, 1913	Major G. Deane, R.L.	Commissioner of National Education, Ireland.	22339-22403	222
Forty-ninth Day.	6th September, 1913	Miss C. M. Mahon	President, Irish National Teachers' Organisation.	22404-22533	228
Fiftieth Day.	10th September, 1913	do.	do.	22534-22676	283
Fifty-first Day.	14th September, 1913	do.	do.	22677-22804	329
Fifty-second Day.	17th September, 1913	do.	do.	22805-23338	339
Do.	do.	Mr. E. Mansfield	Secretary, Irish National Teachers' Organisation.	23339-23345	343

VICE-REGAL COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY INTO PRIMARY EDUCATION
(IRELAND), 1913.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

THIRTY-THIRD DAY.—THURSDAY, 26TH JUNE, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—SIR SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LLT.D., LL.D. (Chairman); The Most Rev. DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross; Sir HIRSH SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN COFFEY; Mr. HERNEAGE E. B. HARRISON, B.A.; Mr. JEREMIAH HENLY; Mr. WALTER McMURROUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.; Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL KETTLE, B.L.; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Very Rev. ISAAC COULTER, D.D., Dean of Kilmore, Representative of the Kilmore Diocesan Association of School Managers of the Church of Ireland, examined.

14634. The CHAIRMAN.—You have kindly supplied us with heads of the evidence which you and your colleagues propose to give?—Yes.

14635. In addition to being Dean of Kilmore, are you Rector of a parish as well?—I am; the parish of Drumlease, Co. Lifford; Drumahaire is the village.

14636. And how long have you been Dean of Kilmore?—Only six months.

14637. Not Rector for a longer time?—I am Rector of this parish for 15 years. I have been a Rector for close on 40 years altogether.

14638. Where were you Rector before?—I was at Macorhamilton, quite near to Drumahaire, for 10 years, so I have been a quarter of a century in that part of Lifford.

14639. And you have been manager no doubt of various National schools, and are at present?—Yes, I have four schools. I have two parishes, Drumlease and Kiltarney, and I have two schools in each, and I am manager of four schools altogether.

14640. Are they large schools?—No.

14641. They are all small rural schools?—Yes.

14642. Under 25?—All under 25.

14643. One-teacher schools?—One-teacher.

14644. With a junior assistant mistress?—In one I have had a junior assistant mistress for some time; but when she had left I really failed to get a junior assistant mistress as the salary was so small and there was nobody willing to take it.

14645. You begin by saying that the unrest and dissatisfaction at present existing between managers and teachers ought to be removed, and that it is a great obstacle to progress in education at present. Are you convinced from your experience that this feeling of unrest and dissatisfaction is general?—Yes, I am convinced of it.

14646. In your own district?—Quite so, in my own district.

14647. And have these teachers taken part in the agitation that is going on—the teachers that you are acquainted with?—They have joined in no agitation as far as I know. Of course, they are members of the Association.

14648. But your impression of the state of unrest is derived from your personal intercourse with them?—Yes.

14649. By talking with them?—Yes; and I am on friendly terms with all the teachers, not only my own teachers, but National teachers in the neighbourhood, and they all have confidence in me and they confide in me their feelings on this subject, so that I think I am in a very good position to know.

14650. So then I understand you to say that a great number of the teachers in your district are discontented?—I think they are all discontented.

14651. It has been denied by some that the discontent is general, and that is why I ask you this question?—Well, as far as my experience goes the discontent is general.

14652. When you say that this discontent is an obstacle in the way of progress in education you mean I suppose that the teachers are discouraged?—Yes, they are discouraged and they do not seem to have the heart to work, and they spend their time fault-finding and complaining, and they seem to be nursing a grievance.

14653. Well, what is the first great grievance?—Well, I think it is just the thing that was mentioned over and over again, that it is the want of uniformity.

14654. Would you put that in the very front?—Well, I think I would.

14655. We have had the most ample evidence on the subject of uniformity, and I shall not trouble you to go into that subject in detail, because we have had an immense mass of evidence from some of your colleagues in the North. Your teachers are greatly troubled by the great differences in the marking?—Well, of course, it does not really affect my teachers so very much, because the average is usually very small so that the results are not such as in larger schools.

14656. That is that they cannot expect to do?—They cannot expect increments. But I have one school where we have an average of 20 and the teacher there had got "good" two years in succession and then the third year when she was hopeful of getting her increment it dropped to "fair," and she considered that she should have got "good."

14657. That was a woman teacher?—Yes, that was a woman teacher.

14658. And have you known cases of a great many men like that?—Well, I have only one man teacher.

14659. And has he suffered in that way?—No, he has not, because he is an old man.

14660. What grade is he?—Oh, indeed he is third grade.

14661. The Bishop of Ross.—Was there any reasonable explanation of the change of the marking in the case of the woman teacher, any explanation that would satisfy your own mind of the justice of it?—Well, I had such confidence really in the then inspector that, although the teacher did ask for re-examination or re-inspection, I did not comply with her request.

14662. Did any accident occur during the year that would explain it, such as children being ill or anything of that sort?—I think not, my lord.

14663. There was no explanation that suggested itself to your own mind?—No, she really thought that it was up to the standard of other years.

14664. Was it the same inspector all through the three years?—It was the same inspector for the three years.

26th June, 1912.]

Very Revd. ISAAC COULSON, D.D., examined.

[Continued.]

14655. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you very frequent changes of inspectors?—Oh, I think as a rule they run to three years.

14656. Have you had anything to complain of in the manner of the inspectors to the teachers?—Well, in one or two cases only in my long experience of them. I thought them exceedingly gentlemanly and nice, but there were just one or two exceptions. I thought they were rather stiff towards the teachers, and in fact they did not recognise the teacher at all when they came into the school.

14657. Did that man stay long in the district?—No, he did not; and in recent years there has been a decided improvement, and the teachers themselves have actually acknowledged that.

14658. There is a great improvement in the manners of the inspectors?—I believe there is, sir.

14659. In their attitude to the teachers?—Yes, and I attribute that a good deal to representations made to the National Board through Organizations such as the one that I represent, because we have represented that to the National Board.

14660. You know the old results system well, you were a manager under that before 1906?—Well, I am not a manager as long as I have been a clergyman.

14661. Were you not manager before the year 1907?—Oh, I was.

14662. You knew the inspectors before that time, you came in contact with them in the last century?—I did, from 1837.

14663. Now, have you any impression that you can give us as to whether the inspectors under the present system are an improvement on the old inspectors, as you say that they have improved in the last two years?—Well, I think as regards their manner that their visits are more acceptable now.

14664. Are they a superior type of men?—Well, I could not say that.

14665. Then you say that you had to complain of want of notice of the inspector's coming—that relates to the one important examination in the year?—Yes.

14666. And what notice do you get?—I believe the rule is that I should get notice on the morning of the inspection. As a rule I get notice on the morning, but, of course, as a busy clergyman I have an engagement a week before and I have never been able I think within the last 10 years to be present.

14667. You have never been able to be present as an inspector for 10 years?—I do not think I have, because of not getting notice until the morning of the inspection, when I have already some other engagements; and another manager in our district who has also four schools in a large parish in the County Cavan, and is one of the men I represent here, told me the other day that during the last eight years he has never had an opportunity of being present as an inspection owing to the fact that he only receives the notice on the morning of the inspection.

14668. Have you formed any opinion as to what length of notice you think ought to be given—the Board say it is very undesirable that they should give any length of notice, or even any notice to the teachers at all?—I have not considered that point; but I think it shows a want of confidence in the manager, that he cannot be trusted, as if he were not a gentleman, that he might confide to the teacher this fact. I think that is certainly a reflection on the manager.

14669. You think a longer notice should be given to the manager, and that it should be regarded as a point of honour not to communicate it to the teachers?—Of course, that is my feeling about it, and I find it rather warmly too, because I would not think of divulging it to any of my teachers.

14670. What length of notice do you think fair?—I think it would be sufficient if we got notice on the Sunday before the inspection, when the manager generally makes his arrangements for the week.

14671. That would be for an inspection that might take place on the Tuesday?—Yes.

14672. You would be satisfied if you got it the Sunday preceding the examination?—I think so; and now as I am on the point I think I might say also that the teacher ought to be protected against persons coming who might not be really inspectors. If a new inspector comes to a district, he does not let the teacher know

when he comes into the school whether he is an inspector or not, and I have heard that another specimen of, and I think a case occurred in the South of Ireland of somebody going to a school on a bogus inspection. I have another point about the inspector's visit in connection with the notice of inspection.

14673. May I ask you a question on the clause in your press where you say there is too much suspicion in connection with the whole system?—Yes; I do not think it looks nice, with due respect to the Board, to suspect the manager of conveying this information to the teacher; and then the teachers have that feeling that there is a great system of suspicion, as if an inspector wanted to catch them in some way; and I think myself that if there was more frankness really between manager and teacher and inspector and the Board altogether, things would go so more pleasantly and prosperously.

14674. And better work would be done?—And better would be done. I am a great man for trusting people till you find them out.

14675. Till you are deceived?—I think it has a good effect, and I know that the teachers have that feeling that there is too much suspicion.

14676. In connection with that, may I ask you this question. While the Board wish and declare that they wish the inspector to be on most friendly terms with the teachers and help them and advise them, do you think it is the case, as we have been told, that the inspectors have been too much of the critic and too little of the adviser?—Yes, I feel that.

14677. Would you agree with that?—I would.

14678. Of course, there are great differences among inspectors?—Well, I have thought for a good number of years before I ever dissent of this Inquiry or any Inquiry, that there was too much fault-finding and criticism on the part of inspectors, and you would fancy that it was the teacher that was being inspected and not the children, and I have known really some of our female teachers to be quite distressed by it for two or three days afterwards, and to be quite nervous.

14679. Do they generally dread the visit of an inspector?—Well, I cannot say that they dread it, but really it is not looked forward to with any sense of pleasure or hope.

14680. Have they ever complained that they do not get advice from the inspector that they had a right to expect?—They do; they often complain to me that they get no help and no advice, and that it is all fault-finding.

14681. And with regard to that fault-finding, have you found, when some other people complain of that successive inspectors contradict one another, that one man will blame what has been recommended by another?—I have heard some of our teachers complain of that too.

14682. And they give contradictory directions?—Yes, and with regard to the time-table, one man contradicts another and changes the time-table.

14683. Now you go on further to say that in addition to inspection there should be an annual examination of all the children, of which the teacher and the manager and the children should get due notice. Of that general examination would you give the teachers full notice?—I would, sir.

14684. How long would you give him?—I think he ought to get a week's notice.

14685. Would a week's notice satisfy your requirements?—I think so; but you must take that into consideration in connection with the school year, what part of the school year it is held at.

14686. Would a week be sufficient notice to the teachers?—Oh, I think so, because at present some of the children are never inspected. They are never inspected.

14687. Do you mean examined?—I mean examined or inspected, because it may happen that when the inspector comes round they are not there, and the next time the very same parties are not there, and my own idea is that if there is one annual examination combined with inspection, of which the teacher and parents and children all get notice, the inspector or examiner would then have some fair ground to go upon in deciding on the position of the school. At present he may go on a wet day when there would be only three

pupils out of 50 or 55 and in such a case as that I do not see how he can give a fair judgment as to the efficiency of the school; and as well as I understand he is not allowed to examine the papers or work of absent pupils, but I am not clear about that.

14688. There is no such rule?—Well, the teachers complained to me that they refused to do it.

14689. Mr. RHEE.—They may have refused, but they are not prohibited?—I see.

14690. The CHAIRMAN.—Does the inspector not take into account adverse circumstances, such as the weather and the time of the year, when he comes to the examination?—Well, I have no means of answering that.

14691. Then your opinion is that at least a week's notice of this general examination should be given to all parties?—I think so. There is a great deal of disease and sprains in our schools and I don't know what is at the bottom of it.

14692. And it extends to the parents?—Yes, and I would be in favour of compulsory education.

14693. Is the attendance bad?—Yes.

14694. Bad and intermittent?—Yes.

14695. Is the Compulsory Act enforced now?—No, not in our neighbourhood. And I think that promotion of the children from one standard to another ought to depend on the result of that examination.

14696. And should the promotion be made by the inspector?—I think so.

14697. Now, as to the extent of that examination, should the inspector examine every child?—Well, that is a point that I am not quite clear about; but I think that certainly from the third standard up they should be examined. I am not so clear as to the very junior children, but I think the upper standards should be thoroughly examined.

14698. You think that in the upper standards every child should be examined by the inspector once a year?—I think so. Some men say that there is a terrible strain, a physical strain, upon the child, but all those strains are for the building of the child, the same as football or cricket. There must be a strain upon the player, but it is all going for good in the end, and it is the same as the result of examinations.

14699. You speak of strain, but we have had a considerable amount of evidence that the examination would be greatly desired and would be looked forward to with pleasure?—It would certainly be looked forward to on the part of the parents.

14700. But that even the children would look forward to it with pleasure?—Well, the bright children would, because I find as regards religious knowledge in my Sunday School work that the children look forward to it with pleasure.

14701. But you would not like the examination to go back to the form it took in the last century under the results system?—Well, I do not know about the results.

14702. Would you like it to be as searching and complete and thorough as that?—I would.

14703. Would you like to return to the old system of results?—Well, I would like the teacher to be rewarded in some way if his school was particularly efficient and up to a high standard; and further, I think that if the pupils got scholarships under the County Council, some means ought to be found for remunerating the teacher of that school, to encourage the teacher. That is an idea of mine.

14704. For distinctions won by pupils?—Yes.

14705. You know the training of inspectors I suppose, how they are trained under the new system?—Well, I understand that they are brought up in Dublin to get six months' grounding or training.

14706. That is not so; they are put under the care of a senior inspector generally for the first six months, and go about with him and watch his methods and then afterwards they are employed, sometimes independently and at other times in connection with another inspector, for another six months. For that time they are under probation and I think we have not found that they are kept here to undergo any course of training. I asked the question myself and it was denied. They are down in the country and they get practical training under an inspector or along with an inspector?—

Unfortunately the difficulty there is that one cannot get rid of his individuality. I know an inspector and I do not believe there is a gentleman round this table who could follow him, his examination was so individual and so rapid; and I always thought that was quite unfair.

14707. And he confessed the pupils?—He confessed the pupils and the teacher could not follow him; indeed I was puzzled myself. I used to invite that man to lunch and I was the only one at the table that could grasp what he said.

14708. Was that man appointed under the old system of competitive examination before 1905?—Oh, yes, he was; he is dead now, poor man.

14709. Of course, the appointments are now made in a different way?—Nothing, I think, could change that man, his mode of utterance or examination.

14710. Then you say the present system is made easy for the inspector and pleases nobody. Will you kindly say what you mean by that?—Well, he seems to be left a good deal to his own sweet will I think, and he just goes according to his own fancy as regards his mode of inspection.

14711. Do you mean that he awards a merit mark to a school by his own momentary impression?—I do.

14712. His momentary impression?—I think that if the hushings were done from the central authority or authority of some sort, those would be more uniformity in that way. And of course, it is easy, because he is free and he just does what he wishes in the school, and examines what he pleases, and is afraid of nobody. And another thing is this. The teachers have also said to me that when the inspector is making his report he should first write up his own report before he reads the former reports; that the inspector should not read the former reports until he has written up his own.

14713. I am requested to ask you to develop the part where you say it seems to me that a reasonable system of inspection and examination might easily be provided that would also test the knowledge of the pupils and be acceptable and fair to every teacher and have the confidence and respect of the manager, as well as the parents?—Well, I do not think it would be quite easy to suggest anything.

14714. I thought that was a summary of your views?—Yes, and I think it can be done by those in authority.

14715. The Inspector or Rector?—You told us that your schools were small schools?—Yes, my lord.

14716. And you had one school that had an average of about 20?—Yes; that is a school that could get increments, it has an average of over 20. She has now about 25 on the roll, with an average of over 30.

14717. Well, I suppose she was on the minimum salary for a considerable time?—She was for some years.

14718. It is for women £51 putting the Birrell grant in?—Yes, that is so.

14719. And she has now £58?—Yes, quite so.

14720. And she had a junior assistant mistress for some time?—Oh, no, she had not; it is the male teacher that has the junior assistant mistress.

14721. How many would the male teacher have in his school?—Unfortunately he is an old man and getting incapable for his work, but he is so near his pension that one could not interfere with him, and the school has gone down a good deal there. He has about 23 or 22 on the roll.

14722. And what is his salary?—£56 a year and the Birrell Grant.

14723. That is £58?—Yes, and, of course, capitation.

14724. Then in one school you have now 28 and in the other school about 30?—About 21.

14725. And how do the other schools stand?—I think the other schools have about 20 each.

14726. And what would be the salaries of the teachers there?—They get £44 and the Birrell Grant.

14727. These are both women teachers?—Both women teachers.

14728. I suppose these are schools for boys and girls?—They are all mixed schools, boys and girls.

14729. Well, then, except one teacher who has over 20 more of the teachers are eligible for promotion at present?—No, and that seems to be an unfair thing, because they have to find themselves and support themselves, and they are doing the same work.

14730. But the cost per head comes to more in your schools than it does in the larger schools?—Oh, yes, but I think the teacher ought to be properly remunerated and left fairly independent, no matter what the average of his school is.

14731. Mr. HANCOCK.—You want a return to the examination of the children. I suppose you have considered that that would involve a considerable increase in the staff of inspectors?—I do not think it would. Why should not an inspector come down to inspect?

14732. It takes much longer to examine all the children than it does to inspect a school in the way an inspector does it at present?—Oh, yes.

14733. And then if you bring back the examination you bring it back with all the evils that were found to attach to the old system?—But I do not think that even would be possible. If the inspection and examination are annual, I think the inspector or the examiner will soon detect that, and that the teacher too will soon find it out.

14734. I am bound to say that that was not our experience in England, and from what I gather from a good many competent witnesses, it has not been the experience in Ireland?—I have no fear of error at all, that is so far as my experience goes.

14735. And have you also considered this question from another point of view, and that is, that it would mean that the uniform school year would have to be given up. Now you have a uniform school year in Ireland?—Yes.

14736. That would have to be given up, because an examination of every child, if it is to be worth anything, must surely be taken at the end of the school year, must it not, for no inspector could examine all the schools in the last two, or we will even put it three months?—I thought it would be quite possible that some way might be found by which it could be done. I did not go into the way of finding it myself; I would throw the responsibility on others.

14737. You have never considered this question?—I have considered what I thought would improve education and encourage it, and then it is for others to decide.

14738. But ways and means must be found?—But I am leaving that to the higher authority.

14739. Would you be satisfied if a thorough and formal examination, I won't say of every child (but probably it would involve the examination of every child), but the testing of every child to the upper standards took place with a full report from the school at uncertain intervals, we will say, every second or every third year?—Oh, I think that would be better than nothing, but I have more faith in an annual examination of it could be done.

14740. You prefer 149?—I prefer 4.

14741. If it were possible?—Yes.

14742. You have not considered whether you would be prepared to give up the advantages of the uniform school year? No, I have not considered that question.

14743. Mr. EAVANSON.—You say there is no Compulsory School Act in the County Louth?—No, sir.

14744. That is the fault of the County Council. You say you wish for it. Why do you not approach the County Council and get them to adopt it?—Well, the teachers, as well as I remember, did approach the County Council some years ago, and I think the County Council could not see their way very well without consulting other parties about putting the Act in operation. Their idea is, that the district being agricultural the children must go home at certain periods. But, apart from that altogether, they are kept at home at periods for which there is no excuse. Parents go to markets and keep the children at home, a whole family at home.

14745. I know in some counties it is working well, and has increased the attendance wonderfully. I think the County Council might perhaps now entertain it favourably?—They have not up to the present.

14746. But I think you say the present system of inspection made it easy for the inspectors. How do you arrive at that conclusion?—I think so, certainly, when I consider that as I said to the Chairman a while ago they make their own arrangements; they make arrangements that suit themselves, and they come in and inspect according to their own views, not taking any direction or interference from any other authority, and there is a kind of suspicion too that in order to have it made easier they encourage the amalgamation of small schools (which is a thing I am strongly against, because the fewer the schools are, the easier it is for the inspector, and some time ago one said to a teacher of mine something about the school having to be closed "After you leave," and I do not think that is fair.

14747. Larger schools get more efficient teachers, do they not?—Well, the feeling in the country is that there are as good teachers and as good teaching (taking all round), and just as good pupils, produced from the smaller schools as from the larger schools in proportion to the numbers.

14748. Do you not think that if your four schools were all amalgamated, you would get a more efficient teacher, and it would be better for education?—It is possible.

14749. I mean to say if the area was such that it could be done?—Oh, yes, I think there are instances where it would be advantageous, for instance, in a town or village I think it is desirable to have two or three little schools made into one school, but in a country place such as I represent, you have no idea of the difficulty the children would have to get to the roadside perhaps two miles, to come two miles down a mountain side, and then to be driven away eight or ten miles more; the thing is impossible to contemplate, this amalgamation.

14750. Even if the Board provided a conveyance?—Even if they provided a conveyance, and we suspect in the country that this conveyance is only a cloak; and besides there would be great risk of accidents, and after a while the school would be closed, and the children would have to walk to the next school. That is our feeling.

14751. Do you know at all a case where a conveyance has been substituted for amalgamation?—I must say that I do not exactly know of one in our own neighbourhood, but it has been done.

14752. Then you have no reason to say that there will be accidents?—It is more than likely that there would be if you have a number of children to deal with.

14753. Do you say that the discontent in your neighbourhood is with the system or with the inspectors?—I think it is with the inspectors; I do not think there is so much feeling against the system. The system is uniform enough, and I think they are quite willing to adopt any programme that the Board propose.

14754. Then the grievance is rather against the individual inspector than against the system?—I think so.

14755. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—There was one that you referred to, that is compulsory attendance. You are aware that there is an Act applicable to Ireland on the subject of compulsory attendance which makes ample provision, according to most people's ideas, I think, for the keeping of children at home for agricultural needs, and that the parents are not subject to penalty for keeping their children for the purposes of agriculture?—That is so.

14756. You are aware of that?—Oh, yes, I believe that is so, but, of course, I had no experience at all of that, because I am outside that district altogether; we are not under the Compulsory Attendance Act.

14757. No point came up as to whether the Compulsory Attendance Act might not be adopted?—Oh, yes, at the County Council, or I say.

14758. Without entailing any serious difficulty so far as regards the parents of the children and their desire to have the assistance of the children in agricultural pursuits?—Yes; I do not know whether the County Council understood that or not. There is a feeling in our neighbourhood (I do not know whether it is so or not, but his Lordship would likely know), that in many parts of Ireland the Roman Catholic

clergy are not in favour of the Compulsory Attendance Act being put into force. That is a feeling I know that we have amongst the section of the community in Leominster, and, of course, if that is so, I can well understand the County Council not doing it if the thing was not pleasing to the clergy.

14759. But I want to call your attention to a particular feature of the Act in such matters. I put the question to Mr. Dale. I read a portion of the Act, and put the question to him, whether he considered it was simple, and he said that he certainly considered it simple, but he could not say whether it was expedient to give so much opportunity for keeping children at home—I am not quite sure that some of the County Council's members made that course, but I am also very sure that our very able teachers were able to meet it on the grounds that you have just mentioned, that it would not at all interfere. There was a question raised a moment ago as regards accidents to children in conveyances. I suppose Mr. Harrison will probably know better about a case in England where a question arose as to the liability of the school authority for an accident that occurred to a child by the carelessness of the driver of the conveyance, for there has been such a case.

14760. Mr. HARRISON.—It never came under my notice.—There is no doubt in the world that parents will certainly make that excuse at the very outset, and will not allow their children in many cases to go, fearing accidents.

14761. Mr. HENRY.—You have stated that there is general unrest among the teachers in your district?—Yes.

14762. Do you think it is good for education to have teachers discontented?—Oh, no, I think it is very harmful, indeed.

14763. And therefore it would be desirable in the interests of education to have that discontent removed if it could by any means be removed?—Yes, that is my object in my being here. My whole object is the welfare of the pupils, and that cannot succeed unless the teachers are in some way happy in their position and contented with their mode of treatment.

14764. And you, as manager, feel that there appears to be some distrust in not giving notice of the examination or inspection in due time?—That occurred to me recently, that it does seem as if the Board doubted my being a gentleman. Certainly I would no more think of giving a hint to my teachers if it was put to my horses than I would of cutting off my right hand.

14765. You are aware that every school is supposed by the Commissioners to be inspected three times annually?—Yes.

14766. Now supposing we had two surprise visits, ought not those to be sufficient to enable the inspector to judge of the character of the work done by the teacher from day to day, and the state of the premises from day to day?—Well I think that a thorough examination should be made.

14767. But the inspector going to a school wants to see the school in its ordinary every-day dress, if I may use the expression, and if he visits it twice a year, ought not those visits to be sufficient to enable him to judge of the way the business is carried on there?—Yes, to judge of the way it is carried on and of the condition of the school.

14768. And as to the cleanliness and order and discipline?—Yes, but nothing else; I do not think the teacher should be punished for the neglect of the building.

14769. You do not think it would be inconsistent with the proper inspection of the school in these circumstances for the teacher to get notice of the one examination you speak about?—No.

14770. It would not prevent the inspector forming an independent judgment of the general state of the school from day to day if the teacher were to get notice of the third inspection?—Oh, certainly not.

14771. And would you be in favour of the teacher getting notice for that?—I would, and the pupils; and that would meet, I think, exactly what I want.

14772. And have you had experience of an inspector coming to inspect a school with only a small number of pupils present?—Oh, indeed I have. Of course, you

cannot let exactly upon a day that will be a fine day, and I have known several occasions of the inspector being most unfortunate in the day that he hit upon.

14773. And you think it desirable that as many pupils as possible should be present?—Yes, that is the point. I am fully convinced in my mind that the object cannot be achieved unless the teacher gets notice.

14774. And you are in favour of every child being examined once a year?—I am, certainly; I am not quite clear about the juniors, but, on the whole, I think I may say that I am in favour.

14775. You are in favour of more examination than we have at the present time?—Well, if you call it inspection or examination.

14776. I mean by examination the actual testing of the knowledge possessed by the children?—Yes, if the teacher and the pupils get notice so that there would be a sufficient number there from which to judge, I maintain, and very strongly maintain, that the inspector cannot possibly judge from a haphazard inspection of three or four children.

14777. And you think it would be more satisfactory to parents?—I believe they would be delighted.

14778. And would it not as a stimulus to the pupils?—Yes.

14779. And not managers better than at present?—It would; I am fully convinced of that.

14780. Now Mr. Harrison raised the point that that would imply the giving up of the uniform school year?—I am not clear as to what is meant by the uniform school year.

14781. Supposing we were to have this testing of the pupils once a year, at what time would you wish the examination to be held in each school—is it at a time when you would have a low average attendance or at a time when you would have a high average attendance?—Oh, I think a high average.

14782. And therefore that time would vary in the different schools up and down through the country?—I suppose the school year does not commence and end at the same time in every school at present, does it?

14783. It does at present?—In a district.

14784. It does at present in the whole of Ireland. Under the results system the school year was so arranged for each individual school that the testing of the pupils came at a time when there would be the highest number in attendance. Would not an arrangement of that kind be better than a uniform school year such as you have at present?—Decidedly.

14785. And especially when they have not any uniform school year in England or Scotland?—Yes.

Mr. HARRISON.—They have in districts; they have in London.

14786. Mr. HENRY.—I suppose they are practically the same in any one district. The circumstances of that district and the schools and the teachers would be very much the same, and therefore the schools in that particular district would be practically examined about the same time. In Ireland at the present time the school year commences on the 1st of July and ends on the last day of June, and that obtains all over Ireland, so that in what we understand by the uniform school year?—Yes, I see.

14787. But if we had, on the other hand, a general testing, it would be necessary that each school should have its own school year?—Yes.

14788. You spoke about inspectors interfering with the time table, and giving contradictory directions. Are you aware that the time table drawn up by the teacher must be submitted to the inspector, and get his approval?—Yes, I know that.

14789. And be signed by him and by the manager?—Quite so.

14790. And have you had experience then of a new inspector coming in and objecting to that time table?—Yes; a new inspector places more importance, say, upon certain subjects than his predecessor perhaps, and he wants to give more time to those particular subjects and curtail another subject.

14791. And that interferes with the arrangement sanctioned by his predecessor?—Yes, that is what I understand.

26th June, 1913.]

Very Revd. ISAAC COCKES, D.D., examined.

[Continued.]

14791. And you told us of an inspector going into schools in some cases without introducing himself and letting the teacher know who he was?—That used to be so; I think there is an improvement in that respect recently.

14792. I suppose you are aware that it is part of the inspector's duty to introduce himself when he goes into a school?—I do not think that was always the rule. I do not know.

14793. And yet, on the other hand, when he is carrying out his duty as inspector, might it not be necessary for him not to reveal his identity for a time, and see you aware of the rule with regard to visitors?—Well I have read the rule from time to time.

14795. "Every teacher is required to receive courteously visitors, and on being requested to produce for their inspection such of the school records as visitors

are permitted to examine." Now, you know an inspector coming into a school for the first time might be anxious to see whether the teacher was carrying out that rule or not?—Yes.

14796. But surely he would tell who he was before he left?—Oh, I think that would meet the case.

14797. You say that under the present system the inspectors please nobody. Now may I ask what proof can you give us of that?—Well, the parents complain that they have no means of knowing what progress their child is making, as there is no examination. That is their idea.

14798. And you think that the testing of the children would satisfy the teacher, the parents and the managers better than in the case at present?—I think so, as far as my experience goes in my district.

Rev. R. D. CROWE, M.A., Rector of Cavan, Representative of the Diocesan Association of School Managers Ireland, examined.

14799. The CHAIRMAN.—I believe you are at present Rector of the Parish of Cavan?—Yes.

14800. How long have you been Rector there?—Eight and three-quarter years.

14801. What was your previous charge?—Drumcree, Portadown.

14802. Were you Rector?—I was Rector of Drumcree.

14803. Had you any independent charge before that?—Yes, I was Rector of Bessbrook, in the County of Armagh.

14804. And now you are manager of schools, I suppose?—I am.

14805. And you were manager at Portadown?—Yes, I was manager of four schools in Drumcree.

14806. And in Bessbrook?—No, not manager in Bessbrook; it was under Mr. Richardson.

14807. How many schools have you now?—Four.

14808. All rural?—No; two rural and two in the town; one an infants' school and the other a mixed (boys' and girls') school.

14809. Are they large schools in the town?—Yes, fairly large, from 70 to 80 in the senior school, and about 30 in the infants' school.

14810. And I presume that those country schools are small schools?—Yes, they are small. One is a fairly large school; we have a junior assistant mistress there. The other school has about 80.

14811. In the town schools have you regular assistants?—Yes, we have one assistant.

14812. One assistant in each?—No, one assistant in the senior school.

14813. Now you get notice of inspection regularly once a year?—I have got notice; sometimes, of course, the notice was short.

14814. It is not always short?—I think so, yes, lately it has been. I think in years gone by I used to get notice two or three days before.

14815. But do you find the present notice renders it impossible or inconvenient for you always to attend?—Sometimes it is, very.

14816. And have you been present recently at inspections?—No, I was not able to attend the last one on account of the shortness of the notice. I only got notice on the morning of the inspection.

14817. Sir RIMAN WILKINSON.—The Dean of Kilmore, on being asked as to what notice he would require, suggested that if he received the notice by the Sunday before the day fixed for the examination, that would enable him to make an arrangement in time. Would you agree with that?—Well, it might be possible for me to attend, but, of course, if it was on Monday, for instance, that the inspection was to be held, it might be impossible for me to attend.

14818. But on the Tuesday?—Well, yes, on the Tuesday I might, that is under ordinary circumstances.

14819. The CHAIRMAN.—His point was, that on Sunday a clergyman must make his arrangements, and if he got notice a few hours before that he could make an arrangement to be present?—That might be, but sometimes we have to make arrangements much longer in advance than that, and especially in a town it might not

be possible for me to manage. In fact I make all my arrangements on Saturday morning; I could not possibly wait till Sunday.

14820. And would you like it on the Friday before?—I would; certainly that would be more satisfactory.

14821. This statement says that your association is of opinion that unrest and dissatisfaction at present exist among the managers and teachers. Now from your knowledge of the managers and teachers, are you able to say that that feeling of unrest and dissatisfaction is general?—Yes, I believe it is. I may say in fairness that there are some cases in which I am told that there is no dissatisfaction locally, but the cases are very rare. On the whole, I should say that it was general.

14822. And you think that unrest and dissatisfaction might be removed?—I do.

14823. Have you any suggestion to make as to how it might be removed?—Well, my suggestions would be principally for an improvement in the relations between the inspector and the teacher; I do not know whether you are taking the prices which the Dean sent in to the Committee in order or not, but perhaps I could deal with it now.

14824. If you please?—Very well. One thing which certainly seems to be a difficulty is the varying requirements of the inspectors in their inspection. There is an indefiniteness about what may be expected from the school and from the teacher from time to time, as different inspectors are present, and what I might perhaps, without disrespect to them, describe as special hobbies of the inspectors making particular points tests of efficiency in the course books, I think, to create a great deal of dissatisfaction among the teachers. And now to give some instances that have come under my own notice (I must not be taken as speaking of my own districts now, but just from information I have received), I have made it my business to make inquiries with a view to this Committee. One inspector, for instance, had reading as his special point, and a school that was good in reading, as far as I could understand from my information, with him ranked higher than a school which might have other excellences, and perhaps not be so good in reading. Another inspector made Syntax his special point, and another would have Arithmetic, and give problems in which catch-questions were put to the children. They were rather in the nature of conundrums or puzzles than ordinary arithmetical questions in some of the cases that I have heard of, and I know in one case where problems were made the special thing the children did very well otherwise, and the report was "good," with a tendency to "very good," but "very good" was withheld on the ground, as I understand, of the arithmetical problems not being satisfactorily answered. Then another inspector made Mental Arithmetic his point, and again another inspector has been getting old examination papers that were used in former years long ago, and has been examining and, I presume, reporting upon the school in connection with those papers. Another thing which is unsatisfactory, I think, is that the inspections are made without due

reference to the time during which the school has resumed work, after, for instance, vacation or sickness, or some other cause of closing. In one case a school was inspected by an inspector (that was his first visit) on the day on which the school re-opened after five weeks' vacation. Now I think that these (as I have called them) special points or labours of the inspectors do not tend to produce satisfaction with regard to inspection of the school. Word goes round (and I myself have often met teachers who have told me that such is the case in their neighbourhood), the word goes round that such an inspector has such a particular hobby or pet which he emphasises, and if there is a little interval between the receipt of that information and the visit of the inspector, the teacher who is wise will work up the children on that particular point, and that school might do much better for that week's or fortnight's special instruction than it otherwise would have done, though the teaching all round might have been very good.

14825. The CHAIRMAN.—I am afraid that that is not unknown elsewhere?—It is known as "lip," I suppose.

14826. The BORER or BOSS.—Would not what you have stated lead to the conclusion that there should be neither inspection nor examination—would not that be the logical conclusion?—Well I would not think that, because I think that there should be inspection decidedly, but I think that where a special point is made by the inspector, and where he makes that special point in all the schools in his district, there is a likelihood of the inspection failing in that one particular point.

14827. If you were able to get inspectors who were able to shuffle off their individuality on entering the schools it might be satisfactory?—I think that is where the difficulty exists.

14828. But I am afraid they won't shuffle off their individuality until they shuffle off this mortal coil?—That may be so, but the teacher suffers meanwhile. I am not for the teacher and against the inspector. I am speaking absolutely with a free mind. I have consulted, I may say, both teachers and inspectors as far as has been within my reach.

14829. Mr. HIRSH WILKINSON.—His Lordship has suggested the difficulty there would be in getting rid of the individuality of the inspectors which would prevent absolute uniformity. Have you any suggestion to make with regard to securing more uniformity than there is at the present time?—Well, I would suggest an examination, an annual examination, whether of the whole school or of a particular portion of it, say, the senior classes, as a guide. It has been suggested to me (it is not my own thought) that possibly a leaving certificate might be granted to pupils in the higher standards which would indicate the efficiency of the school from year to year.

14830. You are aware that there is such a certificate at the present time?—Well, for a very much higher standard. I think it is in the Seventh Standard.

14831. It would not affect your schools?—No, it would not affect our schools, but I would suggest that a certificate of merit or proficiency might perhaps be given for the Fifth Standard, and the teacher might be partly rewarded increment on the result of that examination.

14832. You said you have four schools?—Yes.

14833. Two in the town and two in the country?—Yes.

14834. And in one school alone there is an assistant mistress?—An assistant mistress.

14835. And your teachers are therefore not much affected by the operation of the merit marks. They would not be entitled except in the one higher school to increment by reason of the inspector's report, would they?—Yes, that is so, except in the one school. I think that the school with the junior assistant mistress is. There are about 50 on the roll there.

14836. And have you had any complaints with regard to the lowering of the merit marks affecting your teachers?—I cannot say that any of my own teachers have objected. Of course, the Dean of Kilmore and I represent the Board of Education, and we are supposed to have some information with regard to the Diocesan education.

14837. Have you had many complaints from teachers generally in the district you represent of the merit marks having operated detrimentally to the teachers?—No, I have not had them under my own personal notice, but only from hearsay.

14838. You are in favour of an annual examination, and you think that that would be a benefit to all parties, especially to the pupils and their parents. You agree with that?—Yes, I agree with that. I agree with the Dean, that I think it would be a means of getting over some of the difficulties in the case.

14839. You say that the inspectors should be properly trained for their work. Are you aware of what training they do get?—Well, you, that is the Dean's more particular point, but I am aware that they are brought round by a senior inspector and get an insight into the working of the schools and the inspection after they have qualified under the Board otherwise.

14840. Is there any other training that you would suggest that they should have?—I am afraid that I cannot suggest any other training.

14841. You say their visits should be a help and encouragement to the teacher. Now everyone would be agreed on that, and the question, you see, is whether that is the case at present. You say that at present their visits very often quite disturb many of the teachers and unfit them for their proper work for several days after the inspection. That is the result of your own special inquiries in your own district?—Oh, yes, it is, decidedly. The manner of the inspector has been sometimes very unsatisfactory as regards the feelings of the teacher, especially where an unfavourable report has been given on the school peritously. The teachers are more or less harassed, and they seem to be treated almost with suspicion. I am afraid there is that.

14842. Would you join the Dean of Kilmore in suggesting that the inspector should not refer to the previous marks of the school when he is making up his mind as to what the merit of the school is at the particular inspection that he has undertaken?—I would.

14843. Do you find that the teachers consider that the reference to the previous report operates to their detriment?—Yes, I am inclined to think so.

14844. And so far as the teachers you have confessed you are concerned, they consider that they have received too little encouragement, sympathy and guidance?—Yes, I am afraid I have to hold that too; the fault-finding predominates, and very little praise is given. I may also add that I think it is a pity that the observations that are made by inspectors in the observation book are made without consulting the teacher previously. I think that in many cases observations might be modified or not made at all (that is adverse observations) if the teacher was consulted as to the reason for whatever might be wrong. I have known cases in which observations have been made which would certainly not have been made if the inspector had said to the teacher, "Now can you give me any explanation of this; is there any reason for this particular deficiency?" because the teachers could have given ample explanations. But, of course, the teachers were not afforded that opportunity, and the first that the teacher saw or knew of the observation was when he saw it in the book after the inspector's departure.

14845. And you think that before any observation is made in the book the teacher's attention should be called to the subject, and an explanation asked for?—Yes.

14846. Have you any further suggestions to make with regard to making the inspection of more use for the encouragement of education?—I am afraid I cannot suggest anything.

14847. We have your price here, and you individually agree, I take it, with all the statements that are contained in the price?—Well I do not agree personally with No. 6, that is, that the present system makes inspection made easy for the inspector. My sympathy goes with the inspector very largely, and anything that I have said is not with regard to the inspector so much as with regard to the system under which the inspector is bound to work and the method which he is bound to employ. My feeling is, that the inspector is often placed in a very invidious position,

26th June, 1913.]

Rev. E. D. CROWE, M.A., examined.

[Continued.]

almost an impossible position, where he has to decide at present with regard to instrument between "fair" and "good" as the merit mark of the school. It is a very serious question with him, because he feels, as a matter of conscience that he must do the right thing, and yet he is not given sufficient data to work upon, upon which he can decide the very fine point as to whether the school is "fair" or "good." I know several inspectors themselves feel this difficulty especially now when the question of tone has been introduced as another very important factor in the matter. It is very hard, no doubt, in some cases to say what the tone of a school ought to be. Every inspector has his own idea as to what tone should be or what it represents, and yet inspectors differ very considerably in their own standards. I have myself met with inspectors (I am not now speaking of any at present in my own district), but I have met with inspectors that I should say were themselves very lacking in what I would be inclined to call "tone" and certainly they were not (I will speak of one in particular)—he was not calculated himself by his own personal contact with either teacher or pupils to raise the tone of those that he came into contact with. Of course, there are others the very opposite, and it is either of the exceptions that I am speaking now, but I will say of that inspector that I do not think he was inspecting in my neighbourhood at the time that the question of tone came in, but if he had been there at that time, and was there now, I am afraid that he would not be capable of deciding. I do not take upon myself to judge, but I do not think anyone would say that he was capable of judging the tone of a school; and yet he is expected to make a report in which the tone of the school is considered, and I think that is not fair. I think that though qualified otherwise for his position, it is rather hard to expect that he ought to be able to decide, for instance, between "fair" and "good" as the mark of the school on the question of tone, when there is such a varying standard as to what tone might really mean.

14892. The CHAIRMAN.—That might be an argument for banning such persons from the service?—Well, it might; but the whole question of tone is so vague.

14893. If the Commissioners' inspector could judge of the tone of a school, the Commissioners should be able to judge of the tone of the inspector?—Oh, yes.

14894. Mr. KERRIE.—Have you arrived at a clear understanding of the term "tone"?—I cannot define tone. I do not undertake to do it, but I have a very fair idea of what I consider tone myself, and I suppose every man has, but then it is left to the individual inspector to decide what it means, and that is really the objection I have to it.

14895. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—And will you draw the conclusion that it is undesirable, if other means can be arrived at of maintaining a good standard in the schools, to continue the system of making the incomes of teachers depend upon the merit mark?—I would personally like to see the merit mark abolished. I think the pugnosing of schools is a very troublesome thing and very unsatisfactory for the teacher.

14896. It has not been a very serious question in your district?—Not in my district. I have only heard of it.

14897. The information you have got is the result of your inquiries, and you are satisfied that the conclusions that you have laid before us represent the feeling of the teachers and the inspectors that you have consulted?—Yes.

14898. But you have no suggestion to make with regard to any improvement in the system of inspection that might further education?—Not in the system. Of course, as regards the local conditions of the schools if the inspectors could be led to take those local conditions into account, and the changed conditions of schools, that is a thing that I think might be mentioned apart from what you have said. Now in one of my own schools in Cane we have lost a considerable number of our brightest children by another school being introduced into the town for a different social class of children, a sort of higher school, not exactly an Intermediate school, but a school which has drawn off from my National school a good number of children.

14899. Is that higher school under the National Board?—No, it is a private school.

14900. The BRAMOR or HOSS.—A day school?—Yes, a private day school.

14901. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—And you consider that the inspector ought to take into consideration the absence of those children drawn away to a higher school?—Quite so.

14902. In arriving at a conclusion as to whether the school he was examining should be ranked "fair," "good," or "very good"?—Yes, and especially with regard to tone, because there are a great number of those children who are of the better-to-do class, and therefore their absence would have a sort of influence on the tone of the school, that is, judging tone by a certain standard; and I might say also that sometimes it is very hard indeed to deal with the tone of a school judging it from the moral standpoint, and I may give you an instance. A boy was sent by his father to the school with a note. He was asked to give that note to the teacher. The boy was not very much inclined to stop the full time of school; he was rather a scamp, and his father thought of a plan to persuade him to stay. This day in particular he wanted him to be there, and he gave him a note, telling him this note was asking the teacher to let him home before the conclusion of the school hour, that is, after religious instruction began, half an hour before the religious instruction would be completed. He gave the boy the note, and the teacher received it, and the teacher told him the contents of the note, and the boy said: "Well, my father said otherwise." He showed him the note, and it was, "Please keep So-and-So till the end of religious instruction." When you get that sort of thing it is really a laughable thing, but, on the other hand, it has its pithos, because how can a teacher work against that influence? If you have a low moral tone in the neighbourhood, I think it has to be considered that the teacher has uphill work in doing that.

14903. Mr. KERRIE.—You expect uniformity, but don't you expect the intellectual level or standard of a middle class school to be better than that of what we call a poor school?—Well, my experience is not that it would be better. I have had experience of both, and I may say that the results in my principal school are results which are very often better, but, of course, taken as a whole I think it is so.

14904. That you would get a better standard of acquisition of knowledge?—Well you would in this way. You would have better reading (I find that), and there would be perhaps a little bit of refinement; you would expect that, of course; but as regards the school intellectual development (that is what you confine me to, I suppose), it would be hard to say in that case. I do not know that the pupils of that school would be better mathematicians.

14905. Do you yourself attach much importance to the tone of a school?—Well, of course, the difficulty is the question of tone. If you mean by tone a higher moral level and brightness and intelligence encouraged among the children and cleanliness and tidiness, and all that, of course, I would say the question of tone is very important if it can be controlled. That is the thing.

14906. Could not personal cleanliness be controlled; is not that a matter that the teacher might be reasonably expected to control?—Yes.

14907. And he might be able even with a poor school to brighten up the look of the school?—Yes.

14908. Pictures are so to be had very cheaply?—That is if they are within the teacher's range.

14909. So that there is an educational reality that does correspond with the word "tone"?—Yes; but that word is not defined (if it could be defined) even by the Board. I mean to say that the Board should say what they wanted; they should give details as to tone.

14910. The CHAIRMAN.—I should think you might get 30 different definitions if you wanted them to define it?—I suppose so.

14911. Mr. KERRIE.—You would probably get 18 refusals to define it. But your point is that the determination of tone is left to the personal interpretation of the inspector?—Yes.

14867. And that consequently you won't get under-
 14868. Mr. HENLY.—You have told us that the
 inspectors have varying requirements—some Syntax
 and another Problems in Arithmetic, and another Mental
 Arithmetic. Now can you give us any explanation
 how it is that these varying requirements have sprung
 up under the present system?—How is it that the
 inspectors are led to make these points?

14869. Yes, exactly?—I can not. I do not under-
 stand what the working of the Board is at all; whether
 the inspectors are putting instructions to make these
 points or whether they are the inspectors' own par-
 ticular ideas, I don't know.

14870. Could it in any way be connected with the
 fact that we have a maximum programme, and the
 maximum programme represents an amount of know-
 ledge that no school is expected to attain to, and that
 there is room left for the inspectors then?—Oh, yes,
 I would agree with that, but I would say in reference
 to that, that there ought to be more elasticity both
 with regard to the programme and to the time table in
 view of possibilities in particular districts.

14871. What do you understand by more elasticity
 with regard to the programme?—That where a more
 extended programme of instruction or syllabus could
 be adopted, it might be done, but where a limited
 one was only possible it might be wiser to expect the
 teacher only to work up to a standard.

14872. Is it not possible for a teacher, with the sanction
 of the manager, to submit a modified programme to
 the Board for their approval?—Yes, that is so.

14873. Have any of your teachers done that?—No,
 I am not speaking of my own teachers.

14874. But any of the teachers in your own district
 that you know of?—I do not know that they have ever
 done that or suggested a modified programme.

14875. Supposing that there is liberty given to a
 teacher with the approval of the manager to submit a
 modified programme, would not that meet your point?
 —Yes, it would with regard to the programme, I sup-
 pose. With regard to the time table, too, I think that
 it might be possible to have a little elasticity. In
 some places and for some time it might be advisable to
 give an extra half hour for some subjects, and drop
 off half an hour from some other subject.

14876. Well the time table has to be drawn up sub-
 14877. And have you ever had any experience that
 a teacher wanted to modify his time table in the way
 you suggest, and was refused by the inspector?—No.

14878. Have they applied for permission?—No, not
 that I know of; I have never heard of it. As I say
 the question does not arise in the district, that is in
 my own neighbourhood. I am speaking only from
 information I have got in other districts.

14879. You object to the present arrangement under
 which the manager does not get notice of the inspec-
 tion?—Yes, I think the manager should get due notice.

14880. Do you think it desirable that the teacher
 should get notice of that formal inspection?—For the
 general inspection I do; yes.

14881. On what grounds?—Well, for one thing, that
 it would give the teacher the feeling that he was not
 being treated with suspicion, and that he was not being
 taken at a disadvantage. Another thing is, that it might
 secure a better attendance of the children. Supposing,
 for instance, they had a fair or a market day, and that
 some of the teacher's best children might happen to be
 absent from the school on that particular day, and the
 inspector goes to inspect the school, and if his
 inspection is a thorough one, of course, the absence of
 these pupils would materially affect the report of his
 inspection, but if the teacher knew beforehand that
 the inspector was coming on such a day, he might make
 a special effort to have a full attendance of his pupils.

14882. And so you believe that the examination
 would act in any way as a stimulus to the pupils?—I
 think it would.

14883. Would it be likely to have any effect on the
 attendance?—Yes, I think so; certainly it would affect
 the attendance coming nearer to the examination.

14884. Mr. KETTEL.—You would not object to inci-
 dental visits being made without notice?—Oh, no, only
 those on which the general report would be given.

14885. Mr. HENLY.—And as far as you know it would
 give satisfaction to the managers?—It would.

14886. They would be better pleased with that ar-
 14887. You made one suggestion, that a leaving cer-
 tificate should be given as low as the 5th standard?—
 Yes, I suggested that.

14888. Would there not be a danger, if you gave a
 leaving certificate at that stage, that a number of the
 children might think their education completed and
 leave that school?—Yes; but if a higher stan-
 dard would be possible in the school, it might
 be given in the higher standard; but in many
 of our schools we do not teach the 7th standard. The
 only reason I mentioned that is that there would be
 comparatively a very small number of children in the
 higher standard, and it would be very hard for the
 inspector to judge from two or three children (as it
 might be in the case of a small school) as to what the
 merit of the school was. I see the difficulty, of course.

14889. But suppose you gave the leaving certificate
 or anything equivalent to it to a boy after passing
 through the 5th standard, which is at a very early stage
 would there not be a danger of his thinking that he had
 got sufficient education, and leaving the school per-
 haps become a leader?—Well, it might not be necessary
 to give the certificate at the time it was won; if the
 inspector, say, examined the children with a view to that.

14890. Have you the Compulsory Attendance Act in
 your district?—In Croydon town.

14891. Do you find any tendency of pupils to leave
 school permanently at an earlier age since that Act was
 introduced than before?—Yes, I think so; I think they
 are inclined to leave it at 14.

14892. Just on the limit when they can escape the
 meshes of the law?—Yes, I think so.

14893. And if that be so in the case of compulsory
 attendance, would it not be probable that the granting
 of a leaving certificate at an earlier age might have the
 same tendency?—Well, it would not be quite the same
 thing.

14894. The CHAIRMAN.—What is the average age of
 the 5th standard?

14895. Mr. HENLY.—I suppose it would be about
 12½—I only suggested the 5th standard, but you could
 give it in the 6th or 7th. The difficulty in that case
 would be that there would be a number of schools that
 would not have that standard to work on.

14896. You said that the inspectors in some
 cases treat the teachers with suspicion. Have you
 had much experience of that yourself?—Well, I have a
 little experience. I have known an inspector to go to
 a school three successive days at different hours.

14897. With what object was that done?—I think it
 was done to see that the school was being properly
 worked, and that the attendance was correct.

14898. Was properly recorded?—Was properly
 recorded.

14899. And surely, if the teacher is doing his work
 faithfully, he would not object to the inspector going to
 live in the school with him?—Personally, if I was a
 teacher, I would resent it I must say. I am sure that
 if my Bishop proposed to come and live with me
 (though bishops are the kinder of men), I would take
 it as a great honour, but if I had the feeling at the
 back of my mind that he wanted to make sure that I
 was attending to my business, I am afraid the honour
 would be discounted. I think that is an important
 matter, because it just does lead to the very thing that
 I presume you want to get rid of, and that is this
 feeling of uneasiness and dissatisfaction between the teacher
 and the inspector.

14900. And you say that the inspector gives very
 little praise?—Yes.

14901. With plenty of fault-finding?—Yes.

14902. Are you aware that has long been a charac-
 teristic of inspection in this country?—Well, I have
 known it to be so from my own experience, but that
 does not go very far back.

14900. I think you will find if you look at the report of the Social Science Congress held here in Dublin in 1891 that Mr. FitzGerald, head inspector, read a paper in which he said he inspected a school that was taught by a female teacher, and after the inspection that he gave her some little praise for the way the work was conducted, and the lady burst into tears, and he asked her why and she said: "I have been teaching for 18 years and this is the first word of commendation I have heard during all that time." That is on record. Now, what would be the advantage, as far as you can judge, of the inspector not consulting the observation book before he makes his report, or not consulting the previous minutes?—He would be able to form an independent opinion as regards the proficiency of the school. You mean, of course, as regards his furnishing his report?

14901. Yes?—Well, he could give an opinion as to the general state in which he found the school, apart from what record the teacher or the school might have had previously. A teacher might have very considerably worked up the school from the time of the previous inspection and there might have been two or three unsatisfactory reports against the teacher which would naturally make the inspector a little bit suspicious in inspecting the school.

14902. But do you not think it would also cut the other way. Suppose he found in the observation book that the school was bad, and that having inspected the school himself he thought it "good," would not that be in favour of the teacher, that he had remedied some of the defects of the school?—I would say that his opinion ought to be absolutely independent of the previous inspection in the matter. As regards his own distinctive standard he knows whether the school is indifferent or good or unsatisfactory, and if he finds it to be a good school and it was bad before, then, of course, the teacher deserves credit.

14903. And would he not deserve more credit if he had raised it from "bad" to "good" than if the previous report was "good"?—I do not exactly see that.

14904. Would it not show what an improvement he had effected in the school?—Yes; the teacher should get credit for that improvement I should say.

14905. And how is the inspector to know whether there has been an improvement or whether the faults pointed out in previous inspections were remedied or not if he does not consult the book to know what they were?—Oh, yes, that is assuming that a knowledge of the state of the school previously was necessary for the inspector to do the school justice.

14906. You agree that it would be necessary to know what was the state of the school. Take the case of a highly efficient teacher going into a bad school which was in a very low state of efficiency, would it not be the interest of that teacher that there should be an inspection of the school on the day that he took charge of it, so that he would not be responsible?—Oh quite so; in the case of a change of teachers, but that would not vitiate against the present teacher supposing the previous result had been "bad."

14907. And in the same way supposing the teacher of the school in one year gets an unfavourable report and when the inspector comes next year and reads the minutes and sees what the state of the school was that day twelve months and then judges of the condition at present, if he finds an improvement, would not the effect of that be to raise the estimate of the work done by the teacher during the year? Would not that be making the previous neglect of the teacher a point in his favour?—I do not like to put a premium on laziness in one year which leads to success in the following year.

14908. But do you not think that it is to a man's credit if he has redeemed his mistake?—But it is not his own personal mistake, it is the influence he has had on the school previously. I think he deserves to suffer for that to some extent, but I would guard him from that by the inspector not seeing the report of the previous year before he made his own report.

14909. Could you show me in what way it would militate against the teacher's interest?—I know that this is the case from teachers that I have spoken to,

that where "fair" is the report of the school is is very hard for that teacher to get "good."

14910. What you mean is that under these circumstances the inspector does not form an independent judgment, but relies on the two previous reports; but I do not think that that is consistent with the complaint that has been made in a great many places that there is a want of uniformity amongst the inspectors, for want of uniformity shows certainly that they do exercise an independent judgment?—Yes, but I think that rather confirms the same, because if an inspector takes into account the previous inspections of the school when he is making a new report, I think he is biased to some extent, whereas I think an inspector ought to be able to make a report independently of anything when he went into the school.

14911. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Would you say the education of the children was improved or not in the last few years?—I think there is an improvement.

14912. For after-life are they better educated now—had you any experience of the results system yourself?—Well, I was not manager at the time, but I have been in parishes where the results system was worked.

14913. Would you say that the children are better educated now than they were then?—I would, yes.

14914. I suppose you had plenty of opportunities of seeing children going from a primary school to a factory?—Yes.

14915. Did you ever hear any complaint from employers that the young people were not as well educated now as they were previously?—No, I never heard it; it never came to my knowledge.

14916. You think they are as well educated now for their future career as they were under the results system?—I do, yes.

14917. You were speaking of the school building, that that had a good deal to say to time, and that pictures brightened the place. Do you think that the teachers ought to have to provide those pictures out of their own pockets?—No, no.

14918. Did you ever hear of cases in which teachers had to provide equipment such as maps and books and pictures?—I have not heard of any cases.

14919. Now, would you be in favour of a teacher getting the notice of inspection?—Yes, decidedly, yes.

14920. How long notice?—Well, in sufficient time to have a satisfactory attendance in the school on the day of the inspection; perhaps two or three days' notice.

14921. The objection is that the teacher might brush up and get his school into a certain state which is not its normal state?—That could not be done in two or three days.

14922. You think it is fairer to the teacher that he should get notice?—Yes, I do.

14923. And to the managers too?—Yes.

14924. The manager at present does get notice?—Oh, yes, but only just on the very day of the inspection.

14925. And that is a confidential notice and you see not to impart it to the teacher?—Well, we have never had any directions with regard to that. It used to be regarded as confidential, but, of course, I never impart it to the teacher, because I have not an opportunity, because as a rule before I could communicate with the teacher or be at the school the inspector is already there.

14926. I think we have had it in evidence that the inspector writes to the manager saying that he is coming to the school on such a day, and asking him to treat it as confidential?—That has been the case in former times.

14927. In your experience?—Oh, yes, it has been in my experience in former years.

14928. Mr. KERR.—Don't the neighbouring schools get to know that he is going to inspect?—He does not inspect the schools in succession. Do you mean the senior inspector?

14929. Yes?—They get an idea that the senior inspector is about, but it might be a false alarm. I think there ought to be some incentive to the teachers to improve their qualifications for teaching in the way of study, as regards personal study apart from the school.

14930. The CHAIRMAN.—Would that be a return to the old examination for promotion?—No; I would not suggest that promotion should depend upon it, but that

26th June, 1913.]

Rev. E. D. Crowe, M.A., examined.

[Continued.]

some prize or something in return for satisfactory examination should be offered. I would make it a perfectly optional voluntary thing, and it would give a teacher who might be studiously inclined an opportunity to develop his or her mind, and that would be good for the school.

Mr. CHARLES H. TOWN, Principal of Ballymacarrett Road National School, Belfast, examined.

14003. The CHAIRMAN.—I think you are principal of the Ballymacarrett Road school. Am I right in that?—You are, sir.

14004. How long have you been principal?—Since the 1st of January, 1879.

14005. That is a long time?—It is.

14006. And were you principal of any school before that?—I was only 15 or 19 years of age.

14007. How many years have you been principal?—49 years; I opened it as a National school.

14008. And I suppose it has grown greatly since you went there?—Yes, I found about 30 children, infants when I went there. I had 9 assistants and 10 monitors at one time. My attendance is now reduced by order of the National Board to 275.

14009. What was the maximum?—On some days 470.

14010. And that has been reduced by the Board?—Yes, to 275.

14011. And how many assistants have you now?—Only 4; at that time I had 9 assistants and 10 monitors.

14012. Your building must have been of considerable capacity to take in 470?—Yes; it was at that time generally in the summer that it was so large, and we had a very large playground and we used the playground. We went in for open air teaching a good deal.

14013. How long is it since your numbers were reduced?—Well, since my last inspection. I can tell you from the letter from the Board. The letter from the Board is dated 12th of June, 1912.

Cc. Down, No. 10,867. School, Ballymacarrett Road.

Office of National Education,

Dublin, 12th June, 1913.

Rev. Sir,—In forwarding for your information the accompanying extracts from the Inspector's general report on the above-named school, dated the 21st and 22nd of May, 1912, I am directed by the Commissioners of National Education to request that pending the provision of adequate accommodation in accordance with the terms of Rule 185 of the Code, you will instruct the teacher to reduce the number of pupils on the rolls in the manner specified in that rule to a number sufficient to maintain an average attendance of 275, the number required for the present staff of six assistants.

I am, Rev. Sir, your obedient servant.

W. J. DUNN, Secretary."

14014. That is addressed to the Rev. G. G. Morry?—Yes, the Rev. George Gore Morry, M.A.

14015. Now, I go on to the subject of your well-known deputation* to the Resident Commissioner when you brought up your complaint?—Yes.

14016. That deputation, after some correspondence, was received by the Resident Commissioner on the 6th February, 1911?—It was.

14017. Now, you and your brother teachers had been considering for some time the necessity of making representations about their grievances?—Yes.

14018. And you had correspondence with the Board for some months?—Yes.

14019. I have read letters applying for leave to present the complaints of the teachers, but I should like to know how long before the 6th of February, 1911, you were thinking of going to the National Board and those grievances were pressing upon you?—I think I have the first letter here, but it was a considerable time before that.

* Vide Appendix VIII.

† Vide Appendix XLV.

‡ Vide q. 16669.

14020. Mr. HADLEY.—We had a great deal of discussion on that point that you have raised, and the Commissioners have lately provided a higher certificate. They have issued a circular with reference to it within the last couple of days or last week, and I think the tendency will be in the direction of what you suggest.

Read National School, Belfast, examined.

14021. Well, it seems we officially have no knowledge of that. Will you put that in afterwards?—Yes, I have two copies.

14022. What I want to find out is when the movement began?—The first letter that we wrote to the National Board was I think on the 28th of November, 1910.

14023. I suppose you had been talking over this matter and considering the propriety of getting these things investigated?—Yes; I am sure I am within the mark when I say we were at least six months or more or perhaps a year.

14024. Now, as to the grounds of complaint, I want to find from you in general the grounds you had for wishing to have an investigation, so that in the end of 1910 you had made up your mind to ask for such an investigation; and in the year 1910 I suppose you had been corresponding or talking with one another on the subject?—Yes.

14025. For months?—Yes, we had a number of meetings.

14026. Because I perceive that the lowering of marks of which you complain took place in the years 1907-8-9?

—That is so, sir.

14027. As compared with the years preceding up to 1906?—Yes.

14028. Should I be right in saying that the chief ground of complaint and the one which really had the principal influence in making you ask for this interview was an apparently serious lowering of marks in the year 1906 in the Belfast district?—That is so.

14029. And that the lowering took place in such a rapid and apparently sudden way in 1906 that you became alarmed?—That is so.

14030. And the promotions and increments were thereby stopped?—Yes.

14031. I understand that was the principal ground of complaint that you had?—Yes, that was the principal ground of complaint.

14032. Now, with regard to the total number of marks lowered, it appeared, as compared with the years before 1906, that is from 1904 to 1906, in 1907, 1908, and 1909, your marks had been lowered to such an extent that you alleged that 47 per cent. of the schools had been reduced?—We did. We got circulars sent out by Dr. Bingham and Mr. Woodward to the Presbyterian and Church managers respectively and they got a return of the number of schools. They did not give us the names of the schools but they calculated the percentages and I think it was about 47. I am a Churchman myself.

14033. It is given in the memorandum* of the report of your interview with the Resident Commissioner?—That is right then, sir.

14034. And then Mr. Boyd says on page 170 of that report what I could not reconcile, that most of the schools had been reduced?—Yes.

14035. I think you will find Mr. Boyd says that most of the schools have been reduced?—That is perfectly true. We say most of the schools. We mean all that we were able to find out.

14036. It did not refer to the schools of the whole district but only to certain schools that you had knowledge of?—It referred to all the schools. We knew a number more were reduced, but the teachers would not sign.

14037. I was struck by the fact that the statistics show 47 per cent.?—That was only the numbers that the managers could get, but we as teachers knew a great number of others where the teachers refused to sign, because they thought they would be penalised afterwards.

20th June, 1913.]

Mr. CHARLES H. YOON, examined.

[Continued.]

14999. I will take Mr. McMillan's markings?—I would rather you would ask Mr. Boyd about that.
 15000. But the facts were that Mr. McMillan gave 8.4 "very good's" against 23 for the whole of Ireland as Mr. Boyd alleges, and 26.7 "good's" as against 45.9 for the rest of Ireland?—Of course, we get these out of the Commissioner's blue book.

14971. You do not wish to deal with that?—No.

14972. You say that promotion and increment were stopped in a great number of cases by this lowering of marks?—Yes.

14973. And you thought that a great injustice was done?—We know that.

14974. Was that by reduction of the marks of the third-year of the triennial period?—Yes, and I can give you examples of that if you wish.

14975. Were you affected yourself?—I was reduced, but my salary is a good deal higher than the maximum, and of course I did not suffer financially. That is, I did not suffer by the reduction of marks; the only way I suffered was by the reduction of the average.

14976. Who was your inspector?—Mr. Dewar was the inspector who reduced my school.

14977. He was senior inspector?—He was senior inspector.

14978. And who was his junior?—The previous junior was Mr. O'Connell. I got "very good" from him and then Mr. Dewar reduced me.

14979. And what did the reduction amount to in your case?—From "very good" to "good."

14980. In the third year?—It did not affect me, but I can give you the year.

14981. But you state, for instance, that a school that had got "very good" for five years was then reduced at the end of those five years in the third year of a triennial period by a new senior inspector. That statement is made on page 167?—Yes, the school I refer to is Dundonald. I did not give the name of the school, because at that time I had not the permission of the teacher to do so.

14982. Dundonald is the school you refer to?—Yes.

14983. And does my statement represent the fact that you wished to put before the Resident Commissioner?—Yes.

14984. Who was the senior inspector who reduced that?—Dewar.

14985. Your inspector?—My inspector.

14986. Now, you said you would give us some examples. Perhaps it would be well if you did?—Well, that is an example I refer to.

14987. Dundonald National school?—Dundonald National school in that case.

14988. Is it five "very good's"?—It did.

14989. And it was reduced to "good"?—And it was reduced to "good," and of course Mr. Weir, the teacher, did not get his increment. I do not know whether he got it since.

14990. Mr. Hynes.—You are under-marking that school, it got 5 "very good's"—But at that time when I was making the statement that was my information from the teacher. He was referring in that case to the triennial period, and he told me he had 5 "very good's." He meant that in the first triennial period he had got 5 "very good's" and in the second period he had got 2 "very good's" and a "good" in the third. But at that time also these papers were not prepared. They were not prepared till your Committee set.

14991. The CHAIRMAN.—That was Dundonald school. Now, will you add to this some other examples?—Well, there is one great example of the effects of the marking on a teacher that we have learned since who did not suffer financially, that is through the marks on Ballysloan school.

14992. That is under Mr. Woodward?—That is under Mr. Woodward. I know the teacher of that school. I did not take any of these cases specially.

14993. I thought you made a collection of examples?—No, I had not time.

14994. Let us proceed then, assuming that you will send in those?—I will do that.

14995. Now, you were greatly startled by this reduction, which amounted according to the statement of the inspectors, to so much. Of course, you know that all along?—Yes.

14996. There is a table on page 187 of the statistics of inspectors. The table given there shows the number of "excellent's" and "very good's" in 1904 and 1905?—Yes.

14997. Do you see the table there?—Yes.

14998. There were 182 "excellent's" and "very good's," at the highest, in 1904?—Yes.

14999. They fell to 151 in 1905?—That is so.

15000. So that fall had begun before 1905?—Yes, but it was in the year 1905. There was very little fall between 1905 and 1906.

15001. But then there was a serious fall in 1906 and 1907?—Yes.

15002. From 182 to 152?—Yes.

15003. Then from 1907-8-9 the variation was from 163 to 112?—Yes, to 114 and then 110 and then the last year 112.

15004. Then it comes to this that from 1904 to the last year the fall was from 182 to 112?—Yes, that is what they gave us.

15005. The chief inspectors prepared these statistics themselves?—They did.

15006. And between 1905, as I make it out, and 1907-8, which are separated only by a year or a year-and-a-half, the drop was from 182 to 144?—That is so.

15007. Is that correct?—That is correct.

15008. Now, going on to the Co. Down, the "very good's" in 1906-7 were 14?—I see that.

15009. The "very good's" in 1909-10 were 25?—That is so, sir.

15010. The "fair's" in 1906 were 20?—Yes.

15011. In 1909 they had risen to 32?—Yes.

15012. There was one "mildling" in 1904, and the "mildling's" had risen to 5 in 1909. Is that correct?—That is correct, sir.

15013. Now we have got the statistics of the chief inspectors and you say that you agree with those statistics?—Yes, as far as we know. We do not know where they got all these from.

15014. But still we may assume that they are correct?—Oh, yes, I assume that they are correct.

15015. The next point is, to what do you and your friends attribute that serious fall?—Well, certainly we were under the impression that the inspectors had got instructions from the National Board to reduce the marks.

15016. At the interview that was distinctly denied, I remember, by the Resident Commissioner?—It was.

15017. Now, do you still hold the belief that it was due to neutral instructions?—We do.

15018. Instructions that came from the office?—We do; we believe that these were instructions sent from the office.

15019. In other words, that certain inspectors were instructed or sent down with instructions to stiffen the inspection?—Yes. Do you see, Sir Samuel, somewhere in this report it states that the Resident Commissioner visited the schools where he believed that the inspector had been lenient, and that inspector was sent to another district out of the circuit altogether. We say it was a good hint to other inspectors what to do.

15020. At the same time you have the distinct denial of the head of the department that he issued any instructions?—We have.

15021. Then I thought I discovered in another part of your statement that you attribute the raising of the standard to the chief inspector, Mr. Hynds, that he was the root of the evil, if evil it was?—Well, certainly when we went up to Dr. Sturges we thought that.

15022. It is down in one of your statements?—We certainly thought Mr. Hynds was the cause of the whole thing. I must say that personally I did not hold the same opinion.

15023. With regard to Mr. Hynds?—No, I did not.

15024. You did not regard him as inclined to undue severity?—Well, I can only speak for myself personally. I knew Mr. Hynds very well, and I considered him very fair as far as I knew. He visited my school once

26th June, 1913.]

Mr. CHARLES H. Toole, examined.

Toulmin.

with regard to cookery, and I have the date of his visit and I can give it to you somewhere here. Mr. Hynes visited my school and spoke to the manager.

15025. In what capacity did he come?—As chief of inspection. He came with regard to cookery. We had not introduced cookery, and Mr. Hynes remarked that although we had at the time very little facility (only a small grate) some cookery could be taught, and in my presence he said in the school to the manager that:—“The work could not be carried on in this school if the discipline was not perfect, as it is.” These are the exact words he used to my manager in my presence.

15026. Did he write it in the book?—No, he did not, sir; he did not write anything in the book.

15027. And still you are inclined to think that he was not a man of undue severity?—Well, I am only speaking as I found him.

15028. Only I notice the statement of the teachers that they attribute the thing a great deal to Mr. Hynes?—Yes.

15029. Still you think that the change was a sudden one?—It was certainly.

15030. And it was due to certain inspectors suddenly raising their standard?—Yes.

15031. As compared with the years before 1906?—Yes.

15032. Now, it is alleged on the other side that the years before 1906, prior to the introduction of the new programme, were years during some of which at any rate it was understood at the head office that the marking would be very lenient, because the programme was new to the teachers?—Yes, I have heard and read that.

15033. Was there anything in that?—Well, they may have been a little easy the first year or so, but I did not know.

15034. But it has been told us again and again, and you would naturally expect that when a perfectly new system is introduced the teachers would not be dealt very harshly with for the first years of that system?—I can understand that.

15035. Especially when they would have to teach new subjects?—Yes, I can understand that.

15036. And some of them old and unaccustomed to changes?—Yes, I am one of these old ones myself.

15037. Is it not possible therefore that there may have been a considerable amount of leniency in those years?—Well, I have never found it, but whether I had harder inspectors or not I do not know; but I found the inspectors were always gentlemanly at the beginning at any rate. If they were pretty stiff or anything like that, I did not object when they were courteous.

15038. You have mentioned ungentlemanly conduct on the part of the inspectors. I do not like to introduce the subject, but still it has been brought before us and we are bound to ask the question. Have you come across any instance of this discourteous treatment of teachers?—Well, not very many, sir.

15039. Any personally poured?—Not many, one or two perhaps.

15040. I think it is Mr. Knight, one of your brother teachers, who says that his experience was that they were always courteous?—Yes, he said that in my presence.

15041. And some of your brethren say just the very opposite?—Yes, that is so.

15042. Does that arise simply from the fact that they had different inspectors?—I think every man speaks as he finds the inspectors.

15043. It appeared to me that Mr. Knight might have met different people from Mr. Boyd, for instance, or Mr. Larmour?—Mr. Boyd complained about Mr. McMillan, and I think Mr. Larmour complained about others; but I speak more myself with regard to what has been said to me personally, and about my own school, in the observations of inspectors.

15044. Do you mean that those observations have been harsh?—They are not true.

15045. They have been harsh?—(They have) I mean in the observations in reply to our statements.

15046. I thought you referred to some remarks in the observation book?—Oh, there are some things in the observation book, but that I know are not true.

15047. You think that they are too harshly expressed?—Yes.

15048. That they confirm the charge that inspectors are wanting in courtesy to the teachers?—Yes.

15049. In connection with that, we have had it before us again and again that under this new system one of the great evils of the inspection is that the inspectors do not seem to regard themselves as advisers of the teachers, but rather as critics?—Well, that is my contention.

15050. Is that your experience?—That is my own experience.

15051. I suppose that you are aware that if circulars issued in the name of the Board inspectors are warned to consider themselves as advisers and friends of the teachers?—Yes, I have heard it.

15052. And not to be always fault-finding?—I have read that, sir.

15053. But do you think that a dead letter?—I think it is a dead letter.

15054. In the Belfast district?—In many cases in the Belfast district.

15055. It would not be true of all your inspectors, would it—a man like Mr. Lavelle?—I did not know Mr. Lavelle.

15056. I find he appears to have escaped all criticism?—Of course, I did not know Mr. Lavelle.

15057. There is another point. You say that the inspectors must have been acting on instructions, and yet on page 169* (I forget who it is that says it) it is said by one of you that at present every inspector goes his own way and they are given a perfectly free hand. You may take it from me that one of your friends said the inspectors were given too free a hand?—Yes, I heard that. I do not think I used that expression. It is I that said that it was evident that they were acting under instructions. It is in my statement here.

15058. And you would not agree with the other, that they are given too free a hand?—Well, in that case there was some contradiction in terms.

15059. I thought it might perhaps be reconcilable, but it seemed me a little. However, you do not want to dwell upon that?—No.

15060. Now, as to the statement that you heard from an inspector (I do not know whether it was actually you or one of your friends who heard it) that there was no effective teaching in Belfast?—It was Mr. Dewar: “When an inspector stated, 20 years before he was stationed in Belfast, that there was no effective teaching there ‘in certain subjects.’ I had that in my statement on the authority of Mr. William Moore, principal teacher of Short Strand School.

15061. When was that statement made?—He said he knew Mr. Dewar personally very well. Mr. Dewar was on a visit in Belfast 20 years ago said it to him then, he also stated the same thing to other teachers as inspector in Belfast a few months after he arrived.

15062. After he arrived in your district?—Yes, after he arrived in our district.

15063. Would that be about 1906?—Well, I can give you the date. “And when he told another teacher a few months after he arrived that there was no effective teaching in Belfast.” Mr. Dewar told me that on the 25th of February, 1907; that there was no effective teaching at all in Belfast.

15064. That was said in your own presence?—It was said to me by Mr. Dewar on the 25th of February, 1907.

15065. Would that take in the whole town of Belfast?—Well, that is what he said. Those are the exact words. I keep a diary and when I went home I took a note of it. Anything that I can sleep myself is perfectly true, and I can stand over it.

15066. You are positive, having taken it down, that those were the words used?—Yes, I took it down as soon as Mr. Dewar left me, and I arrived at home.

15067. Was that shortly after he left?—Yes, in less than 15 minutes.

15068. Did you make any remark to him?—Yes, we had a long argument. Mr. Dewar and I had a long argument about the schools being under the Corporation and being under local control.

* Vide Appendix VIII.

15009. About being under local control?—He told me that he thought that would be a bad thing for the teachers in Belfast, and that if he examined a school and found it was not well up, all he would have to do was to write to the Town Clerk or the authorities and tell them that that school was not well up, and the result would be that that teacher would be warned by the authorities that if he had not the school up on his next visit, he would be dismissed.

15070. And did he wish for that system?—I do not remember exactly what he said further except that.

15071. Did he think that such a system was possible?—I think he did. My contention, I may tell you, was that if he did that sort of thing about myself, I thought that they would hardly believe him in the Corporation, as I was longer in Belfast than he was, and my work was known.

15072. Well, he seems to have wished for a system of that kind?—Well, I cannot recollect the words that he used, but it certainly left that impression on my mind.

15073. It is stated that the teachers of Belfast some years ago were regarded as the cream of the profession?—Yes, I think I read that.

15074. And that that was due to the fact that owing to the greater attractiveness of the salaries in Belfast it used to draw men from all parts of Ireland?—Yes.

15075. You think it did in those years?—Well, I come from the country myself.

15076. Did many of your friends come?—Well, Mr. Boyd, another member of the deputation came, from the country.

15077. And Mr. Knight?—I cannot say where Mr. Knight came from, but I think Mr. Larmour came from the country and Mr. Thompson.

15078. Those were all your leaders?—And Mr. Elliott, who was chairman of this inspection Committee; he came from Bushmills.

15079. It is true of the leaders?—Yes.

15080. The Bazaar or Ross?—Do you mean from the country or from about Belfast?—From all parts.

15081. All the country means all Ireland? That is what I mean.

15082. From all Ireland?—Yes.

15083. The CHAIRMAN.—Do you think these men drawn from the South and West?—I know teachers in Belfast at the present time who came from Cork.

15084. Mr. HENLY.—Was Perry a Cork man?—He was, and so also was the head teacher in St. Saviour's. He came from Cork, and his predecessor too.

15085. The CHAIRMAN.—When there is a vacancy does the manager advertise that vacancy widely over Ireland?—I think he does, and I think he also refers perhaps to the training colleges. Professor Henly would know if that is the fact.

Mr. HENLY.—We cannot supply men for large schools, but the principal teachers are registered, and they request us to keep their names on that register, and if a name is down, the Principal of the College will do what he can to get ex-students promoted, so that a good many are recommended by him in that way.

15086. The CHAIRMAN.—So that it appears to be true that Belfast has in past years drawn a good number of teachers from other districts?—That is perfectly true.

15087. The Bazaar or Ross.—Can you give any idea of what proportion?—I could not, but a great many of our friends are from the country.

15088. The CHAIRMAN.—There is a statement on page 160⁹ which seems to imply that the equipment and the state of the building have in some cases led to a lowering of the mark?—Yes.

15089. Do you adhere to that?—I do, and I will give you proof of that. The first I will give you is from Mr. Henson, who is a junior inspector. On the 12th of January, 1910, he said to me that when the inspectors had reduced the marks in the schools in Belfast the managers would be compelled to build new schools or improve the existing ones.

15090. That is that the mark would be lowered to put pressure on the managers?—That is the entire meaning of it. Now, in connection with that I will give you a copy of a report that I copied of Mr. Singleton, principal of the Sedley school. It is not connected with the school in which I am a teacher. This occurred on the 4th of November, 1909. Mr.

Henson reduced the school to "fair." I am going to read his report:—"The school on the whole is efficiently conducted. The teachers are efficient, but work under difficulties, due to the defects in the school rooms and furnishing, and they have to deal with an irresponsible class difficult to impress." These are the words of the report. I give that as an example. The next report on the same school was in 1911. There was no inspection in 1910; but on the 1st of February, 1911, Mr. Henson gave a school "good" and wrote:—"The school is efficiently conducted" (in the other case he said "on the whole," "the school is efficiently conducted and its general condition shows an improvement on the level of last year." Mr. Kelly, on 25th September, 1912, wrote:—"Were it not for a certain laxity in the discipline, the school would probably be classed as 'very good.'" I want to refer then, if you will permit me, to my own report.

15091. That report in 1909, which was the worst report, was partially due to the state of the building and equipment?—Yes, because Mr. Henson says: "The school on the whole is efficiently conducted. The teachers are efficient but work under difficulties, due to defects in the school rooms and furnishing."

15092. Are you aware that the theory of the Board is that those defects are not to be accounted against the teacher?—I know that is stated.

15093. You know Clause 11 of the General Report?—Yes, I know that.

15094. That the disadvantages from these things are to be taken into account in the inspector's report?—Yes.

15095. That is the interpretation of the Board?—That is the interpretation.

15096. You do not think that is the interpretation the teachers put on it?—I do not, sir.

15097. You allege that that is not acted on?—It may be, since the circular came out, but up to then it was not. I have been my own report, "good." This is my first reduction.

15098. What is the date?—7th of October, 1908. Mr. Dewar is the inspector and he says: "The school is much overcrowded."

15099. That is before your numbers were reduced?—Oh, yes: "The classrooms are unsuitable and badly ventilated, and the desk accommodation is so limited that the infant pupils receive scarcely any instruction or lessons in them. Under such circumstances high class work cannot be done."

15100. The point of that is that the equipment and state of the building affect the merit mark of the school?—Yes, and I think I have shown you the reasons.

15101. Was that "good" a reduction on previous years?—Yes, I had two "excellent's," and five "very good's."

15102. "Good" in 1908 was a reduction of the mark?—A reduction of the mark of 1907.

15103. In 1907 you had "excellent"?—I had "very good." I might call your attention now to another matter, for four I might forget it, when this observation book was sent up to the Education Office, when the inspectors were to make what I call their defense, all the good points were marked green and all the bad points were marked red. Now, in my case I think the majority are red; but one of the things, that "under such circumstances high class work cannot be done"; and "the infant pupils receive scarcely any instruction or lessons in them" is marked red. Now, if I am not taking up too much time, I would like to explain that.

15104. Certainly?—The day that Mr. Dewar called to the school for this inspection I was one of a deputation to Dr. Traill. I told my assistant where I was going, and that if the inspector came in she was to tell where I was. Mr. Dewar came in and she went up to tell the inspector and he said: "Never mind Mr. Todd, go on with your work." I naturally concluded when I came back that Mr. Dewar knew where I was. I thought he knew, and therefore I did not give any explanation to him of where I was. At that time he mentioned that the infants receive scarcely any instruction or lesson in writing.

15105. That was owing to the want of desk accommodation?—Yes, but I want to show that we were not

* Vide Appendix VIII.

† Vide Appendix IV. (1).

always in such a state. I had the desks that had been in the school from the time I started about 40 years ago. We had been in treaty with the Board of Works for buying some old desks out of the Newtownards Model, and Mr. Dewar when he inspected the school knew all about this, and he set down in the report that there were 28 desks but the children did not receive any instruction to them. Now, my answer is this. We had seven of the large desks out getting cut down to be the same length as the new desks coming from Newtownards Model, old desks which were now as far as we were concerned. Those desks were thirteen feet long and could not come into my school and they were getting cut down, and I was getting some of the old desks, the only ones that I thought I could use, cut down too. I explained this to Mr. Dewar when I came back, and that is the result, although in my school at the time of the results there was scarcely a No. 2 mark for writing. That is not all, but the inspectors since then have been commending my work. Mr. Dewar knew all this. He even said I had offered too much to the Board of Works, viz., £2 for 17 big desks.

15106. Who was paying for those desks?—I advanced the money. I paid the money but I could raise it by a concert.

15107. Is it the fact that in Ballymacarrett the teachers make themselves liable for these things?—Well, in the majority of these schools in Belfast they have to do so, or they would not be provided.

15108. But the theory of the Board is that they must not do that, that those charges must not be laid on them?—That is all right in theory, but it is not all right in practice. Our secretary wrote to your secretary and asked him to get some letters from the National Board. If he has got those letters, you will find something strange there.

15109. What are the letters?—The report of the investigation that was ordered by the Board, conducted by Mr. Dewar about the Ballymacarrett and Short Street schools.

15110. I know it, and the allegation there was that Mr. Merrett and others were laying on the teachers an obligation for the upkeep of the school for which the teacher is not properly liable?—Yes, that is so.

15111. And the teachers feel that?—Yes; and in connection with that that was the time that I thought Mr. Dewar was very rude to me.

15112. And Mr. Dewar held that investigation?—Yes.

15113. And in the course of it you allege that he was very rude to you?—Yes, he was.

15114. Have you any other instance to give us about marks being lowered on account of the state of the building and equipment?—Those are the three that I had.

15115. Do you think that is so from your experience generally?—I do. About a fortnight ago one of the trustees for one of the big educational firms in town, in fact it is a branch from the house in Dublin, told me about his brother. (His brother is principal teacher of a Church of Ireland school in Belfast), that there was a threat used if they did not get certain kindergarten desks (I think it was) that there would be awful consequences, and this teacher and the assistant had to get the desks.

15116. Out of their own pockets?—They had to raise it some way.

15117. That is to say they are made liable for it?—Yes.

15118. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Was that a threat by the inspector? It was. I could not give that, because I have not got the permission of the teacher to use it.

15119. The teachers brought this Merrett case before the Board?—They did.

15120. Have they done it in any other case?—I think as a general rule they spoke in general terms of the teachers for fear that the teachers would suffer. Our case had become so notorious and so intolerable that it was bound to come out.

15121. Now has it been settled?—No, our manager is ill and has been ill for a considerable time. He has been nine months away at Thrapsey.

15122. Mr. KETTLE.—You spoke about raising money locally by concert?—Yes.

15123. Do you raise money in that way?—Concerts do not pay now so well as they did. At one time I think I should have made £200 or more by a children's concert.

15124. The CHAIRMAN.—Some of this money was made by bazaars in the Merrett case?—Yes, but those were bazaar in connection with the Church; a jumble sale or something like that.

15125. Then there is another allegation that some of the inspectors that you refer to is due to examination taking place early in the uniform school year?—Yes, that is so. We have a very striking example of that if you look at Havemacott school; that is Mr. Boyd's. We have a very striking example there. When the inspection is early the mark is "good"; when it is later it is "very good," and it goes up and down.

15126. Up and down according to the time of the uniform school year?—Yes, my own school is another example. When I read to you, if you permit me, the reports of inspectors previous to the introduction of this system, reports that I was prepared to give Dr. Stalker, but which were not published, but were in the original report that the reporter got, they will show that there was fairly good work done in our school, and, as an example of that, all my assistants are all at the maximum, and I believe I am correct when I state that according to the reports of the Board I have one of the highest fixed incomes of any teacher in Ireland. I am a first of first class teacher.

15127. How long have you been that?—I think it was in the year 1887.

15128. Twenty years ago?—I think I am more than that. I was also offered what was then called an Inspector-Assistantship. In 1887 I was first of first.

15129. And you would not accept the Inspectorship because of loss of income?—Because of loss of income.

15130. What is your income?—My salary was fixed at £220, which included £28 of capitation. In the case of old teachers capitation was taken off their salary. This capitation has since been reduced to £25 by the lowering of the average attendance by order of the Board, notwithstanding Dr. Stalker's promise that teachers would not suffer by the change of system. I lose £5 a year on that head.

15131. And you lost by the compulsory reduction of numbers?—Yes, and I also lost by the school fees of those children.

15132. And no compensation?—No compensation.

15133. How much worse are you now than you were at the beginning?—I may say that I lost about £25 of school fees.

15134. A total of £26?—Yes, of school fees.

15135. The BRIDGE or ROSS.—In thirteen years?—No, year by year.

15136. The CHAIRMAN.—You lose £26 each year?—Oh, I do, in school fees.

15137. Mr. KETTLE.—Have you applied to the Board?—No.

15138. The CHAIRMAN.—What is the excess fee you can charge?—My excess fee for infants and all was 2/.. They were quite prepared to pay large fees in my school.

15139. Give us your idea about the injustice done to the school under the uniform school year?—Well, it is utterly impossible accurately to define the profligacy and the progress the pupils should make in minute portions of a year. For example, Mr. Dewar came in on the 7th of October, and we had opened we will say on the second Monday in August, and I would not have more than six weeks' work in the new classes, he gave me "good," and previous to that it was generally in December or about that time that I had my inspection and I always got "excellent" or "very good."

15140. And you attribute the reduction to the time at which the examination came?—Yes; and also I do not consider that Mr. Dewar was a man who was able to judge a school properly.

15141. Are you aware that the theory of the Board is that an inspector up to his work should be able to

give proper consideration to the time that the school had been at work in making his estimate?—Yes, but I do not believe that he could do it.

15142. You do not think it is possible?—I do not think it is possible.

15143. It has been put before us that he ought to be able to do it?—There is many a thing that a man ought to be able to do that he cannot do. My idea about school years is that we should return to the old plan of each school having its own school year for the examination. I believe in examination. I believe that the whole of the children should be examined; I do not mean individually in every subject, the way they were in the results time, but that the examination of the children should be held as a class examination; for instance, on certain subjects, and I say that that is not only good for the teacher, but it is also good for the pupils.

15144. How far would you carry that examination?—I would have individual examinations in the four R's, reading, writing, spelling, and arithmetic.

15145. And every child submitted to that test?—Yes, in the class. I do not mean to examine each one separately in every other subject. I think that would take up too much time. I know in the time of the results system the children stayed in, and would have worked them for hours if we would have allowed them, but under the present system there is no child that I know, or very few, that seem to care whether they learn anything or not.

15146. Do you say that the interest in learning has fallen off?—Has fallen off altogether, and what is more, I believe in Belfast the children are not educated in the same way as they were in the time of the results days.

15147. In your experience of the two systems that you have lived under would you say that the interest in learning and the improvement of the children have fallen off greatly in the last 12 or 13 years?—I certainly state that.

15148. Is there no compensation for that in greater neatness and intelligence?—I do not think so.

15149. It is alleged that there is?—I know that.

15150. It is admitted that there may be a falling off in minute details but that it is compensated for by finer mental habits and greater quickness of intelligence?—Well, I look upon reading as perhaps the most important thing, because if a child is able to read well and has a love for reading, that child can in after-life improve himself very much.

15151. Is it not the case that reading has become more intelligent?—I do not think so. The only thing that might perhaps be better is composition, for we devote more time to it than we did then.

15152. And you have oral composition and you make the children frame their sentences carefully when giving you their answers?—Yes, and I write, for instance, a model letter for the class and show them under different heads, for instance, if it was an application for a situation. Of course, I do not mean to say that the children transcribe them out. They may transcribe them out if they like, but it is only as a model. I also show them how to write a little letter in other subjects. A child might write a letter to his father, and so on. In the time of the results we did not do that so much, and that is a guide to them and I think they do write their compositions something better, but that is about the only thing.

15153. You think that is the only subject they have improved in?—I consider, for instance, that the science course as at present is practically useless in the schools of Belfast, and I am backed up in that opinion by, I believe, the great majority of the teachers.

15154. Is that because the science is taught too much out of books, and that it is not a matter of experiment?—No; we have no way, first and foremost, to have experiments.

15155. You have an 'laboratory'?—No. Well, in some of the new schools they have; but I was an old science teacher under the Science and Art Department, and we had something definite to go on, and the pupils when they left school had enough to induce them to study further. I taught magnetism and electricity. I taught these subjects myself. I do not meet teachers

now that know much or know anything about these science subjects, and young teachers, of course, when they do not know much about it are not able to impart practical knowledge.

15156. They have none of the practical training?—Minute measuring and weighing, and so on, we still have a little of that. It might be all right in a technical school, but in the schools in Belfast the teachers say that they really cannot do it, and it is a waste of time.

15157. And is that compulsory?—Yes, where they have got the equipment.

15158. As to the programme; what latitude have you had in arranging your programme?—Well, I can submit an alternative programme, but I have never done so.

15159. But you are aware that it is open to you to do it?—I know it is, but from talking to teachers myself I think it was not a success.

15160. You have to get the Inspector's permission?—Yes, and any teachers that I have talked to that did submit a scheme said it was not a success.

15161. Do you mean that it was disapproved?—Well, it was not exactly perhaps rejected, but it had not a success this way that the inspectors did not like it.

15162. That is that if they put that suggested programme of things into force, the inspector would not treat it in the same way?—Not with as great favour or tolerance as the official programme.

15163. And they were afraid to set on a programme of their own construction?—Yes, they thought it was wiser not.

15164. And that provision of the Board about introducing modified programmes is a dead letter?—I think it is a dead letter.

15165. And in Belfast the freedom to arrange your own programme would be very valuable, as it is a progressive city?—Yes, there are certain subjects that might be more useful in an industrial centre like Belfast.

15166. And do not parts of different subjects require greater prominence than others?—Yes. In the time of Dr. Moran I got a very large free grant of drawing materials from the Board, because of the report of Dr. Moran and other inspectors that drawing has been so well and so successfully taught.

15167. That was in the time of the results system?—It was very useful to boys that were going to be mechanics, and so on, and draughtsmen.

15168. And you have a considerable number of young men who are going to the Island works?—Yes, that is so.

15169. And so that is very important?—Yes.

15170. It gives them a chance of rising?—It does.

15171. And it is cultivated with success in your school now?—I do not consider the drawing is just as good as it was in the time of the results.

15172. You give a considerable time to it?—I do.

15173. What is the number of pupils learning it?—Now all children learn something of drawing.

15174. Now, have you anything more to say about the school year?—No, except that I believe that it is the opinion of at least 60 per cent. of the teachers of Belfast, and perhaps more, that every school should have its own school year.

15175. Of course, it is alleged that the criticisms of the present school year, and of the result of the examinations being held too early in it, are due to a wrong conception of what examination ought to be?—Yes, that is so.

15176. And that the fact is that it is not a matter of bulk or quantity, but a matter of quality?—That is the theory, but all we know is from the marks that we get afterwards.

15177. You mean that the inspector does not act on that theory?—I do not think so. That is not my experience of the present inspectors.

15178. And you think there is no principal teacher acting on it?—I do not think so; I do not think they could do it.

15179. There is another thing that I have noticed in some of your criticisms. You say that the inspectors are continually fault-finding, and that one inspector

suggests one method and another inspector suggests another method that may be conducted by his successor. Is that so?—Yes, to a certain extent it is, at least to judge from my own observation book.

15179. That is that they give contradictory advice?—Well they get suggestions in such a way that the manager when he comes to read what is in the observation book will take these suggestions very often as suggestions.

15180. That the manager when he comes to read it will regard it as a criticism?—Yes. An inspector writes, "The children should enunciate their words." The suggestion there is this, that we (the teachers) are not doing our very best, and perhaps it is owing to the fact that the inspector himself speaks in such a tone that the children do not know, and the children speak in a tone that he does not know.

15181. Mr. KERR.—Does the Board accept some in it?—I think it must.

15182. The CHAIRMAN.—Now you go on to say in one of your criticisms that it is a great drawback to the system of inspectors that they have not had any experience in teaching?—Yes.

15183. Does that account for some of the defects that you have been talking of?—I believe it does.

15184. What remedy would you propose?—Well, I think that not only should the inspector be a successful teacher, but that he should also get his post by way of competitive examination.

15185. Let us understand. Do you wish to make the rank of inspector open only to National teachers?—No, but I know some others that would. I think that would limit it too much.

15186. Some of your brethren wish it?—Yes, they do.

15187. They wish the inspectorship to be a grade of the profession up to which any teacher could mount?—Yes. I should perhaps modify that by stating that if a man had got training in some other schools such as secondary schools, or so on, he should have a chance.

15188. Would you include a University man who had been teaching in a secondary school?—Certainly.

15189. But you would require him to have reasonable experience of teaching?—A good deal of experience of teaching.

15190. Supposing he had the personal qualities which recommended him for the post to the Commissioners, would you be satisfied if he went into one of your schools for six months to get experience?—If he took sufficient time to know the different schools that he would be likely to be called upon to inspect.

15191. You would require a probationary during his period of probation to take work in an elementary school?—Yes, I should think so.

15192. But I observe that there are twenty-two gentlemen already on the inspection staff who have been elementary teachers?—I know that.

15193. I think you would wish for a larger proportion?—Well, I would like that it was made more open to the teachers, and I think teachers who have taught a certain length of time very successfully ought to get a proportion of the appointments.

15194. But you do not claim all the appointments?—I would not, but I know some that would.

15195. You think it ought to be more open?—Yes.

15196. And a person who has not been a teacher should be required to obtain some experience before he is made an inspector?—Yes. I think the National Board in many cases have made a very bad selection.

15197. I think you say you would return to the system of competitive examination?—I say there ought to be competitive examination too among the candidates.

15198. Should it be nomination first and competitive examination afterwards among the selected?—I think so, sir, some idea like that.

15199. How would you arrange the nomination?—A man that had given a certain number of years of thoroughly good service.

15200. As teacher?—As teacher, yes.

15201. But I am speaking of other possible candidates?—Well, I have not thought about that much, but I certainly know that there are many who would confine it absolutely to teachers.

15202. It has been found very difficult in other cases to adopt a pure system of nomination. Conceiving comes in, and all sorts of influences, and the candidates selected may not be the best persons?—That is so. I know one case of a young man who had so distinguished himself at college that he was sent to Paris for a time (I don't know the length of time) for mathematical research. This man also had been acting not as a paid teacher, but as assisting his father in a National School, and you would certainly think that this young fellow was almost a born teacher. He went up, and he was one of the candidates selected, but not appointed, and I believe one of the reasons given by some of the Commissioners was that he was far too good, and that he would be leaving the Inspectorate behind long. That is a son of Mr. Boyd, of Ravenscroft, who had a distinguished career in college.

15203. What University?—I think it was in Belfast Queen's College.

15204. And he went abroad for mathematical research?—Yes, as a scholar.

15205. He had got a scholarship in mathematics?—Yes. Now I think in that case there was a mistake made, and I know that teachers have been selected, whom certainly neither their appearance nor their manners nor their education would make suitable to be inspectors.

15206. And you would object to their appointment?—Quite so.

15207. There is one inspector who was a National teacher, and what struck me was that he was one of the men bitterly complained of for his severity and want of sympathy?—Yes, I know that, and then I say that is a bad selection.

15208. Mr. KAVANAGH.—It is not always promotion for a teacher to be offered an inspectorship?—It is not.

15209. The CHAIRMAN.—Some of you allege that you think the junior inspector's increment and salary depend on his senior's recommendation?—Yes.

15210. Do you think that is true?—Yes, I heard that, I understand, the junior has to get a dossier signed by the senior. I heard that statement made.

15211. But you cannot confirm it?—I cannot.

15212. Some of your people say that at present there is too much examination?—I know what you refer to, that is that we are supposed to prepare for inspection, but the inspectors have examination. We should be allowed to prepare for either the one or the other. We should have inspection pure and simple or else examination.

15213. You object to the combination of the two?—Yes, at the same time.

15214. You think that the third general inspection should be entirely examination?—Yes, entirely individual examination in reading, spelling, writing and arithmetic—class examination.

15215. And that the two surprise visits should be pure inspection?—Should be pure inspection. I fully agree with that.

15216. That is the way you would conduct the inspection. You would have two or three visits without examination, and then a general examination once a year?—Yes. I may say this, that a teacher in his own school will go home some days—say he will have an inspection in his school, he will go home quite depressed. I know it has happened with myself, to say, "My school is not doing well; the teachers are not doing well;" and next week I may go home as happy as you like. And I suppose the same thing happens to an inspector, and he cannot judge the school.

15217. But he can judge some things at once, such as the cleanliness of the school, the discipline of the children in the classes, their manners, and their dress, and so on, and the general air of the school?—I have no doubt he could do that.

15218. They allege that if you magnify the examinations too much you will get back to the old results system, and you begin to make the teaching mechanical, because teaching always follows examination—that is a formula that we have had put before us. Do you see any danger in that?—I do not think so. I think the present way is not a fair test of the state of the school. Now take my own school: one morning I

20th June, 1913.]

Mr. CHARLES H. TOOD, examined.

[Continued.]

may go into it, and owing to meetings and the like, or the carelessness of the caretaker, the school does not look clean or nice. What can I do then, for the children are there, and if the inspector came, it would be marked down against me, that the school was not tidy or clean.

15219. Why should not the school be tidy and cleaned up?—I say it should be, but it is not. On the last day I was in the school before coming up I was angry and very mad to see that it was not in its usual clean state.

15220. And did the inspector come in?—No, he did not.

15221. But he might have come?—He might have come, and he might have judged that that school was not clean.

15222. Would he not have taken your explanation that a meeting was held the night before?—I must say that the inspectors do not seem to set any value on teachers' explanations.

15223. There is a subject that some of you have dwelt upon a good deal, and that is the way teachers are criticised for want of preparation, even senior teachers?—Yes.

15224. And do the inspectors insist on a man of 30 years' experience preparing his day's lesson in the same way as an assistant ought to do?—Well, I know instances, and I should think the majority of inspectors do, and the majority of the teachers do prepare. I must say for myself I have never been asked for my notes. When an assistant spoke to Mr. Chambers (he was at one time my superior) about the preparation of notes I must say that he said to her, "I know Mr. Tood, and he knows more about that sort of thing than I do—ask him, he will show you," and I would break my heart if I had to write notes. If I sat down and wrote notes of a lesson, and I was already half done, I would think "there is something else I might improve," and I might, perhaps, begin and re-write that thing, and I might do that the whole evening. I give an example of how absurdly far that can be carried. I can give you as an example the case of Mr. Smith, of Larnham, who is a Bachelor of Science and Principal of the school, and one of our best men in Belfast. Mr. Homan was the man who reduced his marks. Mr. Chambers went into that school either to confirm or do away with Mr. Homan's mark. Every subject that Mr. Smith was teaching he was asked for his notes; for reading, and for every subject, he was asked for his notes for that particular day, and the man had written a number of notes, and Mr. Homan said, "Oh, these are of no use," and that was a teacher of the Technical Institute.

15225. Do they require preparation from day to day from experienced teachers in elementary subjects?—That is what they do, sir, when they ask for them. My inspector asked my assistant: "Are those the notes you have for to-day; it is very strange that you have not them dated."

15226. They might repeat the same notes from year to year?—Yes, and you will see also where Mr. McMillan objects to teachers using notes that were taken out of an educational journal on a certain subject that they had to teach.

15227. In other words, he required them to make original notes?—Yes, original notes.

15228. In the reply of the chief inspectors they dwell upon giving wrong statistics as your interview?—Yes.

15229. You remember what was complained of, I suppose?—Yes; well it was Mr. Larnham who gave them the statistics; he made them out. He will be with you some time, and as I am not great at statistics myself, I think it would be better to wait for him.

15230. The chief inspectors say the districts have been altered twice since 1906?—Yes.

15231. So that the schools now are in different districts from what they were, say, ten years ago?—Yes, I saw that, but I really did not understand it.

15232. They allege again that the rise in the marking for all Ireland is due to a great extent to the recent appointment of junior assistant mistresses in one-teacher schools?—Yes, I heard that.

15233. Whereas, owing to the large size of the Belfast schools, that cause does not operate, having such a number of assistant teachers?—Yes, I know.

15234. Do you think there is anything in that?—I know one case where a teacher got "very good" in a small school, and when he got a junior assistant mistress the mark was reduced.

15235. They then say that you would not select a number of schools for examination?—No; you will see that in our correspondence.*

15236. You refused to do it?—We refused to do it.

15237. What was the ground of that?—You represented 111 schools?—We represented 111 schools. The reason was that we had never seen the observation books of these schools, and we had never seen the reports, and we thought it would be unfair to the rest if we made a bad selection; but I will tell you how Mr. Ward selected the cases.

15238. Did you consider that the selection that was hit on, a selection by chance, was fair?—We did not.

15239. In what respect?—Well, first and foremost, the men that were sent down know all about these schools. They know all the marks that were already given, and at the same time the teachers all considered that Mr. Hynes was responsible for lowering the marks, and, therefore, we considered that it was altogether unfair, and I may tell you the plan that we did propose, and told Mr. Ward, and he laid it before Dr. Sturkie, and you will see it was a very much fairer plan. We said that a senior inspector (I am responsible for this myself) might be selected from another part of Ireland to come to the schools in Belfast; that he should stop at a certain hotel; that he should not know the schools that were reduced or were not; that he should get a number of schools that were reduced and a number of schools that were not, but that he only got one school per day; that he got a letter of instructions from the National Board that he was not to open the observation book, and the teachers were prohibited from telling anything about it who the inspector was or what the mark was, or whether it was raised or reduced; and every morning at 10 o'clock he was told to go to visit such a school and to report, and when he visited that school that he showed the teacher the letter of appointment for that particular school, and he was then, in the presence of the teacher, to send up the mark that he thought the school was entitled to, to the Education Office, before leaving the school. We held the view that that would be probably a fair way, and we would have a fair inspection, and Dr. Sturkie, I believe, at first consented to that.

15240. Where is that proposal to be seen—is it amongst your correspondence?—It is not; we gave it to Mr. Ward.

15241. Can we have it?—I could not say.

15242. It has come to us as a surprise. I never heard that?—We gave that to Mr. Ward. We told Mr. Ward that that would satisfy the teachers, but Dr. Sturkie then gave various reasons why it should not be adopted, and we came to the conclusion that it would show that the system of marking had broken down, and that therefore he would not consent to it, and that was the conclusion we came to, but the reason that he gave to Mr. Ward was that it would not be professional to send one senior inspector to another senior inspector's district, and both senior inspectors might be looking out for chiefs of inspection after that. That was the plan that we suggested.

15243. How did you regard that review of the two chiefs of inspection?—We thought it was of no manner of use whatever.

15244. I wish you would give your reasons for thinking that?—I stated that the teachers of Belfast believed that Mr. Hynes was responsible for the reductions, and, therefore, he would be going to judge his own work and would seek to justify it; also even in those cases where the chief inspectors thought the mark too low, the mark was not raised. I think that nearly covers the subject.

15245. But has it not occurred to you all generally that the Belfast case seems to cast a doubt on the whole system of merit marking?—Oh, yes, it does.

* Vide Appendix XLV.

20th June, 1913.]

Mr. CHARLES H. TONE, examined.

[Continued.]

13246. Have you considered whether it is possible to obtain anything like a stable system under the present arrangements as to merit marking?—No, it is not possible.

13247. You have gone into it and considered that?—We have. I can give you, as an instance, the case of the teacher of St. Clement's School in Mountpellet, a Church school, taught by an old priest and master of mine. Mr. Dewar visited that school, and he gave this teacher "very good" the very same year that he refused me. Now, we will take the body of Mr. Dewar's report on that school and consider it along with mine. Mine is a better one than that of the teacher that got "very good." St. Clement's is a new building, quite up-to-date. Where is the uniformity, or where is the credit for adverse circumstances? I could give you also other instances.

13248. You were reduced to "good" owing to the promise to some extent, I understand?—Yes.

13249. Being overawed?—Yes. By the way, you will notice that in this statement by the teachers Mr. Boyd gives his own particular case. You have seen that, I suppose?

13250. Oh, yes?—He gives the case of his own school. You might say that my case is not given. We agreed that we would give our own particular cases if called upon. In going through the whole business we took up a good deal of Dr. Starke's time, and Mr. Boyd went to Dr. Starke towards the conclusion of the interview and said, "My own particular case is there, will you print it?" and he said, "If you have in written out give it to the reporter and he will print it"; and when we came home Mr. Boyd told me this. I wrote to Dr. Starke to say that my own particular case was in the original statement that was handed to the reporter, that the reporter had it, and would he permit him to put my case in, and he wrote me to say that he would not. Well, I have the original statement, and if you will allow me I will read what it contains.

13251. Was this the statement that you wished to submit to Dr. Starke?—The portion that was left out. This was the original statement that the reporter had in his hand. "But to come more particularly to my own case, as from the letter dated 20th January, I infer that you wish to consider it, but as I had not quite completed when the observation book with reports was taken away, I shall leave your indulgence. I can be set right if I go wrong in any particulars. To show the opinion of inspectors previous to the introduction of the new system, I shall quote from their reports, commencing with Mr. Bale, whose examination lasted for five days in December, 1898—

"This is a large and important school, and it has been conducted with vigour and success during the past year. I have pleasure in reporting my high opinion of the zeal, forthrightness and ability with which the entire teaching staff have discharged their duty, and of the satisfactory progress indicated by the results of the examinations. The ordinary branches have, on the whole, been well taught, and drawing and algebra, as extra branches, have been taught with marked success. The school is doing very useful work in an important locality." His next report is in somewhat similar, though not in quite so flattering terms. Mr. Pedlow, in 1891, says—"836 were examined and 341 passed for promotion." In 1893 he says—"I noticed improvement generally." Mr. Strong, in 1895, says—"This large school is conducted and taught on the whole with efficiency and success." Dr. Beatty, in 1894—"Only 19 failures occurred in the three main subjects in a total of 409 children examined, and the answering on the whole was of a highly creditable character." Dr. Beatty, in 1896—"This large school has been extremely well taught during the past year, and showed only seven failures among 888 children who were examined." Dr. Beatty, in 1896—"360 children were examined, and, with 12 exceptions, passed in the subjects for promotion." Dr. Beatty, in 1897—"876 children were examined. The defects of the previous year have been removed, and except in the reading of 3rd and 4th classes, extremely high success had been obtained in the teaching, not merely of the ordinary branches, but also in singing (which is exceptionally harmonious), drawing, book-keeping, algebra (thoroughly well taught to both boys and girls

in all three classes), and geometry and mensuration. The general proficiency fully bared short of 'excellent,' and the discipline was satisfactory. Dr. Beatty, final report in 1898—"The attendance at this school still continues to increase; 427 were examined. The ordinary branches were in almost all respects 'excellent,' and in the classes up to 3rd, containing 298 pupils there were only two failures."

13252. That is the last report under the old system?

—Yes. Then I say—"I think I have given enough to prove the character of the school previous to the introduction of the new system. Since 1898 we have had seven inspections with six different inspectors, and been awarded two 'excellent's' and five 'very good's' before we were reduced by Mr. Dewar. Six of the staff, including myself, responsible for the work done in the year in which we were reduced, were the teachers who earned the majority of the reports which I have quoted. Mr. Fenton visited in December, 1901, and although he did not reduce the mark, there was something in his demeanour that convinced me that he would like to do so. We had a conversation about the general reduction taking place in the schools of Belfast. I told him that such a course by juniors could not produce a good effect, as no teacher of any standing could have much respect for the opinion of a man of very little experience, and that teachers would begin to inquire what character the new men, formerly teachers, bore in the localities in which they taught. This conversation Mr. Fenton would appear to have reported to Mr. Dewar, for on three occasions Mr. Dewar told me that a teacher had threatened Mr. Fenton with the Belfast Teachers' Association, and that he had told him to reduce away as long as he had him, Mr. Dewar, at his back. On the first occasion this statement of Mr. Dewar's produced very little impression on my mind, as I did not think for one moment I was the teacher referred to. But when he returned to the charge on his visit of the 30th March and 7th October, 1906, and reiterated Mr. Fenton's statement and his own reply, I knew he must refer to me. I said nothing, as I had never threatened Mr. Fenton. Mr. Dewar inspected on 7th October, 1906, and when the report came down I found he had reduced it to 'good.' After some consideration I went to see Mr. Dewar, told him I was not satisfied, that I did not want to appeal to the office, that if he promised to come on next inspection I should be satisfied. He promised that if he could possibly find time he would come, but that he could tell the mark a school was entitled to in five minutes, and that he believed we got what we deserved. I left perfectly convinced he would come, and that he must see the report should be again raised. He did not come, but sent Mr. Benson, who did not raise it, and so I have been driven to join others in condemnation of the present system of inspection and examination." That is the part that was left out.

13253. Was what you have been reading given to Dr. Starke?—Yes, handed in his presence to the reporter, and that also explains what I said about Mr. Benson visiting my school. I now hand in my original statement.

13254. That was in 1906?—Yes.

13255. Did Mr. Dewar make a statement in reply to that?—He did, sir; it is in the observations that are printed.

13256. Mr. Benson—Now, with regard to that grave statement that you are just after reading from, that Mr. Fenton was authorized to go on reducing the mark and that Mr. Dewar would stand by him, have you any evidence of that?—None, but Mr. Dewar stated it to me on three occasions.

13257. Stated that he had instructed Mr. Fenton to reduce the marks, and that if he reduced the marks he would stand by him?—To reduce away as long as he had him (Mr. Dewar) at his back. I wrote that to Dr. Starke afterwards and I got no reply.

13258. And you think, then, from that that Mr. Dewar was, perhaps, acting on instructions. Do you think that?—I thought at the time that it was a bit of spleen to show me that he had power to do it, and that he would do it.

13259. And as a result of the change that took place there was a general fall in the marking in Belfast of somewhere about 8 per cent, was there not?—

Well, I am not prepared to go into that, because the way we did was this. We divided the cases among certain teachers. I took one branch. Mr. Larmour took all the marks, and they were prepared by a small committee, of which Mr. Elliott was chairman. I was on the committee. I will just say this much, that I did not go into the figures, because that was out of my province, but they are perfectly right.

15260. They are perfectly right in that?—Yes.

15261. You have also told us that Mr. Dewar stated that there was no effective teaching in all Belfast?—Yes.

15262. Was that statement made in your presence?—Yes. He said, "There was no teaching there in certain subjects," and he said that "There was no effective teaching at all in Belfast."

15263. And then you have shown us at the same time that some of the better teachers have been attacked from all parts of Ireland to Belfast?—Yes.

15264. And is it not the fact that the schools of Belfast have a higher percentage of "excellent" and "very good" than the average for all Ireland?—They had at one time.

15265. And they have still?—I do not think so.

15266. I should like to see the latest statistics, for the latest that I had under my consideration would show that they had 29 per cent. of "excellent" and "very good," the average for all Ireland being 23 per cent., so that if there is no effective teaching in Belfast, and if the marking is higher than the average, as I think it is for all Ireland, would it not follow as a matter of course that the judgments of the inspectors on those schools would be unreliable?—Oh, yes, I consider that they are; I consider that the judgments are unreliable, because we get schools that have been raised by one and lowered by another.

15267. Now, speaking of your own school, when the mark was lowered did you, acting there as principal, and knowing that school for a great many years, and knowing the character of the work which the teachers were doing, think that there was a lowering of the proficiency in the school in that year?—No, there was not; there was no lowering of proficiency.

15268. According to the best of your judgment was the school up to what it had been in the other years?—It was.

15269. And was the mark subsequently raised again? No, it was never raised again, and I do not expect it to be ever raised again.

15270. The CHAIRMAN.—You are still G.?—I am still G.

15271. Mr. HENRY.—Why do you not expect to be raised again?—First and foremost, the evidence will show that it is under a bad system, and the teachers hope it will be abolished, but that is not all. I did not blame Mr. Hynes for not raising it, for this reason, that I thought he dare not, but if you look at my observation book at his next visit I think he was preparing to raise it.

15272. You are aware that Mr. Delworth has said that where the senior inspector adopts a higher standard the junior inspector is influenced by him?—That Mr. Delworth says that?

15273. Yes.—I think that he would be. If he takes a higher standard and marks more severely the junior inspector will do the same thing.

15274. Did the chief inspectors in their investigation agree with Mr. Dewar that there was no effective teaching done in Belfast?—No, I do not think so.

15275. What ground have you for thinking that, for they say—"We do not desire to minimise the real and efficiency of the great body of Belfast teachers, and in the latter part of this memorandum we give some figures to show their superiority to the country colleagues?"—Yes.

15276. Now, does not that seem to show that the chief inspectors agreed with you that the Belfast teachers, at least many of them, are of greater efficiency?—Yes.

15277. And, therefore, that better work should be expected from them?—Yes.

15278. Well, now, when you appealed, what according to your interpretation of the Board's rules, was your right as teachers in reference to that appeal?—Do you mean the appeal to Dr. Starke?

15279. I mean the appeal to the Board?—Oh, yes, I

had an absolute right to appeal to Dr. Starke or to appeal to the Board.

15280. For what?—To inquire into this business and say whether there was injustice done to the teachers.

15281. How far should the inquiry extend—All teachers appealed who felt that they had a grievance?—Yes.

15282. Then that being so, how many of them again did you think they had a right to have investigated?—You will see that we said that we thought they ought to investigate every case, and see justice done in every case.

15283. And was that done?—No, certainly not.

15284. How many cases were investigated?—I think there were only 20; I am not sure about the exact number; I think 15.

15285. The CHAIRMAN.—That was about a seventh taken out of 100?—Yes.

15286. Mr. HENRY.—Then that did not fulfil the promise the Commissioners make, that in case a teacher has an appeal it will be considered, and if an individual teacher has a right to an appeal then have not a number of teachers a right to an appeal?—I think every teacher of those 111 schools had a right to appeal and a right to redress if he was badly treated.

15287. I suppose you have that table before you that was given on page 100?—Yes, I have.

15288. Now, look down the list, if you please, and say in how many instances Mr. Purser's mark is more favourable than the mark given for the last year?—Yes, when there is any change at all it is in favour of Mr. Purser's marking, I think. I really cannot understand that change in the first case, "fair inclining to good," and "strong fair," or "weak good," and I think Mr. Purser is the better one of the two. In both cases, if you take Alexander's School, the first one, there is a difference.

15289. This is a return of marks that were given to the school before the investigation. There is a difference in Irish Street, at Southwell, at Clough, at Holywood, at Dunadree and Cappagh?—Yes.

15290. That is six cases out of thirteen?—Yes.

15291. Now when the chief inspectors were sent down their report corroborates your memorial to the extent that in forty-six per cent. of the cases the schools were not marked in accordance with what they thought they should be?—Yes, that is so.

15292. Should that, in your opinion, not have shown the Board that it was necessary to investigate the whole of the cases?—I think it should.

15293. But it did not?—It did not.

15294. Then was there not a denial of justice to a large number of the Belfast teachers?—Oh, yes, we look at it in all cases that there was a denial of justice, because even in those cases where Mr. Purser and Mr. Hynes said the mark should be raised the mark has not been raised.

15295. So that even in the cases which they investigated, and in which the chief inspectors reported that the marks were too low, still the original mark remained?—Yes, that was so.

15296. And what was the use of the appeal under such circumstances?—I do not see that it was of any use at all.

15297. Do you think that is the way that appeals should be dealt with?—No, I do not think so; we entirely disagreed with the methods of doing it, and with the persons that did it. We thought that it was open to suspicion that these gentlemen knew the marks already that were given to the school, and that if they were responsible for the instructions they would be certain to judge in their own favour or in favour of the inspectors who were carrying out their instructions.

15298. It has been suggested, and I believe it is a fact, that the new system that was introduced in 1900 was introduced in a very lenient way?—I think perhaps for the first year or two.

15299. Was there not a stiffening up about the year 1904 and 1905 all over Ireland?—Well, I believe there was.

15300. I suppose you are aware that at that time there was a great increase in the number of dismissals for inefficiency?—Oh, yes, I know that.

26th June, 1918.]

Mr. CHARLES H. TOWN, examined.

[Continued.]

15301. And a general complaint among the teachers that a large number of teachers under what Dr. Traill characterized as "enforced inefficiency" were driven out of the service?—Yes.

15302. And therefore that the period of leniency could not have extended up to 1906 or 1907?—It did not.

15303. So that the full standard was applied before that fell?—Yes, before that fell.

15304. Now it is stated in the chief inspector's report that in one case the leniency degenerated into laxity?—Yes, I saw that.

15305. Now if that inspector in a portion of the County Down adopted too low a standard, were the teachers responsible for that?—They were not.

15306. And if they worked up to his standard for a number of years, was it right suddenly to lower their marks because a new inspector adopted a different standard?—It was not fair at all.

15307. What do you think should have been done under the circumstances?—Well in that case I think in the first year there might have been some circular sent round that the inspectors would look into matters more particularly; but then we do not believe that.

15308. But assuming it to be true?—Well, assuming it to be true, something might have been done in that way so that the teachers might have got timely warning.

15309. You think that the teachers ought to have got notice that a higher standard would be required for the following year if the mark of the school were to be continued?—Yes.

15310. Instead of a sudden dropping of the mark?—That is so.

15311. And that was not done?—It was not.

15312. Now with reference to this system of merit marks, I think you have expressed an opinion that it is impossible for anything like uniformity to be maintained at present?—It is. I do not see how two inspectors could agree, and I do not even consider that any inspector is able to judge the mark that a school is entitled to for fractions of years.

15313. And suppose you were in favour of this system of merit marks, would you be in favour of telling the children more fully than at present?—I would.

15314. Now are not the inspectors supposed to visit your schools three times in the year?—Yes, that is in their instructions, I believe.

15315. And if they came for two surprise visits, would you consider that sufficient to see the school in its ordinary normal dress?—I think it would be. I think it should be.

15316. And do you think the teachers should get notice of the final inspection?—I think they should, and I think it should be held in the last month of the year.

15317. Now taking the schools generally, because Belfast in one respect is typical of the schools generally, at what time of the year should that general inspection be held?—Well, I would give each school its own school year.

15318. Then should it be held at a time when a large proportion of the pupils would necessarily be absent, or should it be held at a time when the teacher could reasonably be expected to have a large proportion of them present?—When a large proportion was present. I say that the inspection, especially in country schools, should be held before the children retire to do farm work.

15319. Then in other words you would be in favour of each school having its own school year?—Yes.

15320. And that would be desirable in order to enable a large proportion of the pupils to be present?—Yes.

15321. And get the benefit of the inspection or examination as the case may be?—Yes.

15322. Now it has been stated that if that were done there would be cramming, and that we would get back to some of the evils of the results system. Supposing the teacher got short notice could there be cramming?

—No, I do not think that there could be cramming. Teachers hold that there is more cramming now than in the time of the results system, that you are cramming away all the time, expecting to have your inspection.

15323. It has also been contended that if you have examination, examination will dominate the teaching. Now, as a matter of fact, do the teachers observe the mind of the inspector and the whims and fads of the inspector, and try to meet them at present?—Well, I believe most teachers do.

15324. So that if that argument is a fatal objection to examination it applies equally to inspection?—Oh, yes, they know the fads of inspectors very often before they are very long in the dream, and they work accordingly.

15325. So that this argument applies equally in both cases?—It does.

15326. You have made a very strong statement, to my mind, that at the present time the children take no interest in the work of the school. Is that your own experience?—I am sorry to say it is, and that of a great number of other teachers. Now I will exemplify it. The children under examination at the end of the year formerly knew that promotion depended on examination, but nowadays the inspector walks in, as Mr. Dewar did in October.

15327. Has that any connection whatever with the promotion of the children?—None whatever, and they know it.

15328. And they take no interest?—They take no interest, and what is more, if the inspection is to last for two days, the second day they do not seem to care whether they attend the school at all or not.

15329. And the parents do not take the same interest that they used?—No, they take none.

15330. And do not take the same pains to send their children to school?—No; at the time of the results' examination we had a maximum attendance, but now the parents do not care whether the children are present or not.

15331. And you think that a loss to the children?—Yes.

15332. And a loss to the country?—Yes.

15333. And speaking as a teacher whether you would consider you would be safer (that is, that you would get a mark more in accordance with the work you had done) if the pupils were tested, or if they were left to the impressionist system that we have at present?—I think we would get nearer a fair mark under the examination system than under the impressionist system.

15334. And then as a teacher you would prefer it?—Yes.

15335. So that I presume you are in favour of having your own school year with more examination and any amount of inspection at the teachers' visits?—Yes.

15336. But at the same time a regular examination at the end of the year. How far would you carry the examination?—I think every child that made a certain number of attendances during a certain length of time in school should be included in it. Of course, if that child has not been that length of time at school, I could not be held responsible for the child not knowing much of the programme, nor would it be fair to give me credit if he was much better than the others.

15337. You think it would be fair for an inspector to take into consideration the length of time each child was in school?—Yes.

15338. And therefore that it would be necessary to have a list prepared giving the number of attendances of each child?—Yes, unless that inspector would take your word for it that that boy was only there a short time. You could show him the roll book. If it was to be very particular then, of course, you could prepare a return.

15339. Then with regard to the programme you have told us that some of the subjects on the programme are not used at the present time, and you mentioned elementary science as one. Would you object to

elementary sciences provided you had proper equipment?—My great objection is that it takes up time that might be more usefully employed.

15840. At what?—At arithmetic or some other subject like that—arithmetic or reading, or any other important subject. It would take up time, and that is one objection, and you see that we have too many subjects, and the attention of the children is distracted by want of concentration. I might further say that there is nothing definite in the science programme at the present time. There is nothing definite that the children can carry away. It does not seem to me that it is of importance to ascertain the specific gravity of a hen or duck egg. I do not see that it is of sufficient importance to the children. I think if we are to teach science the teachers should be allowed to select some subject that he was pretty well up in.

15841. Of course, you are aware that the science programme has been introduced into the schools not exactly for imparting knowledge or teaching science in the true sense of the word, but to form habits in the children of neatness and order, and love of truth, and inquiry after truth, framing hypotheses and drawing conclusions?—Well, I think it is simply absurd for children attending National Schools to expect any such thing from the limited amount of knowledge of science that they can possibly obtain in our schools.

15842. Have you taught the programme yourself?—Not lately. None of my teachers knew anything about the science programme, and in the evenings I got them together, and helped them as well as I could with the programme, but I am not good at manipulating, and we had a good many brousses, and, of course, that meant expense to myself, and we ultimately dropped it, and that was the way I taught my own teachers and they taught the classes.

15843. Do you think that the pupils of the Third Standard would be capable of grasping the experiments which were presented to them on specific gravity?—Oh, not at all capable.

15844. Or in the Fourth Standard as they are at present?—No; I do not think that they can take it in at all, or any idea of what is meant when we have finished.

15845. Or that if a body is weighed in air and a fluid they will not be able themselves to draw the conclusion that the loss of weight represents the weight of the displaced fluid?—I do not think they could grasp it.

15846. You think the subject has been introduced to the pupils too early in their career?—Yes.

15847. And that they would be better engaged in studying subjects which you consider more essential to their welfare?—Yes, that is what I mean.

15848. What amount of freedom do you think ought managers and teachers to have in the framing of the programme, not of the time table?—Well, I think that while there are certain subjects common to all National Schools, there other subjects that would be proper to the locality, that is in an agricultural locality it would be well to have some instruction in agriculture, but in a locality like ours, where boys will go to the shipyards or something like that, it would be better to direct the programme a little in that direction.

15849. Would you approve of the principle that in the drawing up of the programme what may be called the essential subjects should be taught in every school?—Yes.

15850. With liberty to the teachers and managers to take other subjects suited to the requirements of the locality?—That is what I mean to say.

15851. Now in the memorandum* that was drawn up for the guidance of the Board in 1900 that was the principle that was laid down in framing the programme?—Yes.

15852. Would you approve of that?—Yes.
15853. And in the programme that they presented to the schools in 1900, do you think that that principle was applied properly?—I do not think so.

* Vide Appendix XXX.

15854. You think there are too many subjects at present?—Oh, too many. Neither the teachers nor the children get sufficient time to concentrate their ideas upon lessons on those subjects that are essential.

15855. Have you found that Irish children, taking them as a whole, are not remarkable for steadiness of application?—They are not.

15856. And then the wide programme over which their energies are spread at the present time tends rather to encourage that lightness, if I may use the expression?—That is my opinion. Suppose you have a number of infants in a school at the present time they simply know nothing that is necessary in a school. When I got them occasionally they cannot read.

15857. And what can they do?—I don't know what they can do; they can do those things that I know precious little about.

15858. Can they dance?—Oh, yes. I think they can, but I think school life is too short for anything like that.

15859. What do you think they should do in the infants' school?—Well, certainly, I do not think they should give so much time to those kindergarten matters or what you call them. I think the children ought to be taught at the same time reading, writing, spelling, and arithmetic.

15860. The Bance or Ross?—Even infants?—Even infants; they should learn something.

15861. At what stage would you start a child at the alphabet and try to make it read?—I think the child might begin to learn a little at six.

15862. You would not start it at four?—Formerly we did teach them to read a little, and they were examined.

15863. Did you think that right?—It was hard on the children. I think it would be better perhaps if they got taught out in the open air.

15864. Mr. HEART.—In a word you would be in favour of more freedom for the teachers and for the managers, and of more concentration on the part of the pupils?—That expresses it very well.

15865. Now are you quite clear that in that report that you read the mark was lowered on account of the state of your school, that is the school buildings?—Yes—the school buildings and the desks. We always had sufficient desks. I explained to him that the desks we had got from the Board of Works were too long to be put in the school, that a carpenter was cutting them in half, and at the same time he was cutting the best of our own to the same size. Mr. Dewar knew all about it. He had visited the school previously.

15866. From your intercourse with teachers in Belfast, can you give us any specific instances in which it was expressly stated that there were agreements between teachers and managers that the manager of a school would not be responsible as long as the school was in an unimproved state?—Well I cannot at the present time definitely state that. Teachers keep these things very quiet for fear of getting into trouble, and teachers generally throughout Belfast, if there is any improvement to be made, are the people who have to make that improvement. I am speaking generally now.

15867. But you could not give us exactly specific instances?—No, I cannot.

15868. Because it has been stated here, as was mentioned by Sir Samuel Dill, that the more the circumstances (the school buildings and other things) are adverse to the teacher, the easier it is for that teacher to get a report of "excellent"?—I never met any teacher who got it, and I gave you three instances which I think are fairly conclusive that that is not so.

15869. So that you cannot believe that that really represents the state of things throughout the country?—I do not.

15870. Now with regard to the investigations, do you think the investigations are conducted on right lines at the present time?—I do not.

26th June, 1913.]

Mr. CHARLES H. TONE, examined.

[Continued.]

15371. What do you mean by investigation?—Well the only definition I can give is, that it is an inquiry into the relations between the manager and teacher or the manager and inspector.

15372. Or the teacher and inspector?—Yes.

15373. Or the teacher and the Board?—Yes; of course the inspector means the Board in that case.

15374. How do you think they should be conducted?—I think they should be on sworn evidence, because although a man ought to be as particular about telling the truth without swearing, still if he is sworn he knows very well he is liable to be held up for perjury if it is proved against him. I suppose Sir Hiram can say if that is so.

Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—If you ask me if it is advisable to introduce sworn testimony I am strongly opposed to it.

Well I may tell you the teachers generally think that it would be right to have it on sworn evidence.

15375. Mr. HUNT.—Do you think in a matter of investigation affecting the teacher, he should be allowed professional assistance?—Oh, certainly, he ought to be allowed to employ a solicitor.

15376. And should the inquiry be open or private?—It should be open.

15377. To whom?—Well I suppose to the press, but that is a point I am not caring very much about.

15378. But in the case of the investigation with regard to your schools in Belfast before Mr. Hynes and Mr. Purser went down to investigate the matter, particularly the inspectors were present at your deputation?—They were.

15379. They got the privilege of asking any questions they chose?—They did.

15380. How many did they ask?—I do not think they asked more than two or three; that is altogether, the whole lot.

15381. And then they went back and wrote a number of statements affecting the professional character of a number of men in Belfast?—Yes.

15382. And those statements, whether they were true or whether they were a misrepresentation of the facts, you had no means of meeting, because you did not know what they were?—We applied for them; we wrote for them, and we were told that the observations of the inspectors were confidential.

15383. Although they were making charges against some of you in your professional character as teachers?—That is so.

15384. Do you think that was fair?—I think it was very unfair.

15385. What do you think ought to have been done?—We should have been supplied with copies, and allowed to write our replies.

15386. An objection that was raised here more than once to that course of procedure was this, that if you were allowed to send in a rejoinder they might ask then to be allowed to send in another rejoinder, and then it would go on ad infinitum?—Yes.

15387. What suggestion would you have to make on that?—I think that when they were allowed to write their observations they should have gone on the general question the same as we did, and not have made charges against us.

15388. That they should have dealt with the matter that was before them and nothing else?—Yes, that is all.

15389. But they did not do that?—They did not.

15390. Or, on the other hand, if they sent in an additional statement that should have been furnished to you?—Yes.

15391. Now I think you gave us the opinion that you are not in favour of the merit marks?—I am not.

15392. That you think that they ought to be abolished?—Yes, both the merit mark of the school and the merit mark for the teacher.

15393. Now comes a very important point. What would you substitute?—The same as they did just at the end of the results period, to send a report on the school.

15394. A general report?—A general report.

15395. And then about the award of increments?—In my opinion the increment should be annual and automatic in the absence of any serious deterioration of duty or any serious report.

15396. Do you think would that take away any stimulus from the teachers to work as efficiently as they do at present?—I do not. I think the teachers would just work as well as they do at present.

15397. And your impression is now that on the whole the education given in the schools is not as thorough and as efficient and as good a preparation for after-life as what was given formerly?—Nothing like it.

15398. Is there a greater amount of slackness on the part of the children; are they more alert, and do they answer better?—Certainly they are livelier in a way that we do not want them.

THIRTY-FOURTH DAY.—FRIDAY, JUNE 27TH, 1913.

At 25, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—Sir SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman); The Most Rev. DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross; Sir HERMAN SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN COFFEY; Mr. HENRAGE E. B. HARRISON, B.A.; Mr. JEREMIAH HENLY; Mr. WALTER MCMURROUGH KATYAGH, D.A.; Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL KEFFLE, B.A.; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Mr. C. H. TONE, Ballymacarrett Road National School, Belfast, further examined.

15400. Mr. HARRISON.—I think you told us that you preferred not to go into those statistics and to leave that to somebody else?—I did not make myself specially up on them.

15401. Now, have you any statistics showing the number of cases for the three years, say, 1906, 1909, and 1910, in which the lowering of the marks affected the increments adversely?—I have. I have this list* of schools which I think you already have with the marks and the inspectors' names, sent in to the Belfast Inquiry Committee, that is our Committee.

* Vide Appendix XLVII.

15402. I do not want the number of cases in which the merit mark was reduced, but I want the number of cases in which the reduction of the merit mark affected the increments?—Well, I have not, of course, exactly the number, but what I mean to say is this, that in the majority of those cases sent in to us the principal teacher suffered financially owing to the reduction of the mark.

15403. Could you or your Association let us have the exact number of cases in which some financial disability resulted from the lowering of the marks?—

We can, so far as this return with the supplementary return is concerned. Last night I wrote what I may call a little statement about that. You asked me about that, Sir Samuel Dill?

15404. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—I think we had better have that down?—

Mr. HARRISON.—Quite so.

Witness.—Well, I was asked yesterday to give cases where teachers had suffered financially by the lowering of marks, and in reply I may state that in the majority of the cases tabulated in the form we present, viz.: "List of schools with marks of Inspectors' names sent to Belfast Inquiry Committee," the principal teachers suffered in that way. We had not time to complete the tabulations before getting them typed, as we have perhaps as many more. I may be permitted to tell how we got these "marks." We sent out eight forms to all the schools in Belfast districts, and some other Associations got copies from us for their members. These forms contained a large number of questions, and when filled in were certified by the sender to be correct. If you wish, Sir Samuel, when I return home I will send specimen copies of the forms, and also a list of teachers who have suffered. But to come to one particular case which has come under my own notice. Rule 123 of the Commissioners says an assistant teacher when appointed to a large and important school as principal will receive special consideration. I am not sure of the exact wording, as I have not a copy of the rules before me. An assistant, a young lady, was appointed principal of a Model School, girl's department, in December, 1906, and at her first inspection Mr. Dewar lowered the mark to "good." There are two assistants employed in the school. Mr. Dewar gave the principal and let assistant each "very good"; but lowered the mark on account of the work done by the 2nd assistant, who was appointed and kept in the school by the Commissioners themselves. I submit a copy of the marks awarded by Mr. Dewar. You will see in this case the mark of the school was not the same as that of the principal, as was stated in evidence here. I may mention that the principal taught arithmetic and algebra as an extra subject, was recommended for full fees; but the Commissioners refused to pay the money, as there was an interval between the time when her predecessor was transferred and her own appointment, although the principal gave extra lessons so as to cover the number of lessons required. This slight interval was caused by the Commissioners themselves, as she immediately took charge on receipt of her appointment. When, year after year, the principal and her 1st assistant found that no matter what efforts they made Mr. Dewar would not raise the mark they determined to resign and go to Canada. Fortunately, a change of inspectors took place and the mark was raised. Mr. Kelly, writing in the observation book, says: the 2nd assistant was transferred to another Model, but was kept there only for a very short time, and a new capable assistant appointed. The Board had it in their power, if it was thought desirable to retain the incapable assistant, to appoint an additional one, as they have recently done in the boys' department, where the average does not warrant it. During the time that the mark was lowered it was admitted on all hands that the pupils were receiving a very superior education, as was exemplified by the result of several competitions they took part in, viz.: Hygiene and Temperance, in which they stood first in Ireland this year, having obtained 46 medals in the examination under the auspices of the Irish Temperance League, with only 81 pupils presented, while there were thousands of pupils all over Ireland competing; also in drawing, writing, and woodwork, at the Agricultural Show; and in composition in connection with the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. The net result, however, is that the principal lost a very large sum of money, and was caused a great deal of worry and heartburning. Perhaps when the Commissioners read this evidence they will see justice done. This is the record of the principal in the Education Office.—Miss ——— has been head mistress of this school from 31st December, 1908. Her present salary is ———, exclusive of augmenta-

tion and capitation grants. Prior to her appointment to ——— Girls' Model School she served as assistant in the Belfast Model School from April, 1907, to December, 1908. Her reports for the last six years are as follow:—December, 1907, "very good"; November, 1908, "excellent" (assistant); January, 1910, school "good," principal "very good"; September, 1910, ditto; November, 1911, ditto; January, 1912, school "very good," principal "very good." The average attendance of the Newtownards Girls' Model School was 90 for the past calendar year. The staff consists of principal, two assistants, and mistresses. One of the late assistants, ———, served in the school from August, 1906, to April, 1912, and it was stated that in view of the somewhat unsatisfactory character of her work the school failed to obtain a higher mark than "good" during that period.

Now here is Mr. Kelly's report:—"I am very well pleased with the manner in which the pupils have acquitted themselves. I have hardly noticed a weak point in the school, while the proficiency was in many respects of a very high order. Where there is so much to commend it would be almost inadvisable to select any matters for special mention; but I cannot help referring to the excellent reading, recitation, and grammar, of the IV., and arithmetic of the V. The principal and assistants deserve credit for the highly satisfactory manner in which they have performed their duties. I must not omit saying a complimentary word of the superior deportment of the pupils, and the interest they take in their work."

15405. Mr. HARRISON.—This has nothing to do with my question. I have asked the statistics showing the number of cases in the years 1908, 1909, and 1910, in which the lowering of the mark led to an immediate loss of increment?—You want me to give that?

15406. Can you tell me in how many of the schools which were re-examined by the chief inspectors there was any question of the increment being affected?—I could not. I will take a note of that.

15407. Any cases where the teachers suffered loss of increment owing to recent reports?—I will take a note of that and send it.

15408. Can you tell me why the teachers did not accept Dr. Sturkie's offer of January 4th, 1911?—That is, for 50 schools?

15409. Yes?—They thought that what would be done in that case would be that the inspectors would find reasons in those 50 cases why they were reduced. That is, they would make reasons if they could not find them, that they would be bound to show cases why these were reduced, and that would be the end of the question. As I say in my statement to Dr. Sturkie, the teachers as well as the managers have lost confidence in the inspectors.

15410. Then I presume that you did not agree with the course that was ultimately adopted by the Board?—We did not; we were never consulted about that.

15411. It was the action the Board adopted on their own initiative?—It was.

15412. And there was no idea that it was satisfactory to the teachers?—Very unsatisfactory; it was looked upon by the teachers as a louse.

15413. Now, you told me yesterday that you wished to return to the old examinations. Supposing that these merit marks were abolished, would you still wish to return?—Yes.

15414. To the examinations?—We would.

15415. Would you wish it to be an individual examination of every child with a record of the results?—Yes; in some subjects—a class examination in other subjects.

15416. You clearly, I think, in the evidence which you have given collectively, recognise that the old individual examination was not a success?—Well, it was not a success this way, that we did not like the individual payments for each child. That is one thing we did not care about, and another reason was that it was carried to an enormous extent, that is that certain inspectors got gradually to questions more difficult year by year, and they had certain fide.

22th June, 1913.]

Mr. C. H. Tose, examined.

[Continued.]

15417. But you also say* that there is too much examination at present?—Because it is coupled with inspection. We have in our schools neither inspection nor examination: it is a sort of union of the two at the same time, and the reason is also that inspectors examine a class on what the children have not yet gone over, and sometimes at the beginning of the year, so, for instance, in the case of October, 1910. Now, we say that at the very beginning of the year we have what we call spare work, and the following week has to be done at the very end of the year: and also if I had taught a child, for instance, some rule, we will say, in fractions at the beginning of the year, while I am still teaching this advanced subject still they are made to practice on fractions, and at the end of the year the children see it for examination, but not at the beginning.

15418. May I take it that the objection is to the time of the year at which the examination tests are applied?—Well, that has a great deal to do with it.

15419. Would you wish inspection at the earlier visits and examination at the end?—Yes; that is to say the incidental visits at the start might be inspection; but the last examination, which we should get in the last month of the year and of which the manager and teacher should get due notice, should be examination.

15420. Well, that means, of course, although without the result loss, a return to the old system, does it not, or an approximation to it?—It is an approximation to the old system.

15421. Then surely would you not say that that was rather putting the heads of the educational clock back?—I do not think so. The way I look at it is this. The pupils take no interest whatever in the inspection. If there was examination, there would be a stimulus for the pupils, and also it would please the parents as well as being a stimulus to the children.

15422. Now you told us yesterday about that, and you said that the parents did not know what progress the children were making, owing to the absence of the examination at the end of the year; but surely you conduct examinations as head teacher, do you not?—I do.

15423. And you make reports to the parents of the progress of the children, do you not?—Well, in some schools it is done, in some it is not; I certainly do not.

15424. But if you do that, surely that will satisfy the parents?—Well, it does not.

15425. That it amounts to this that they have not the same confidence in you as they have in the outside authority?—Well, it is not that exactly. The parents know very well, or at least they think, that we teachers are so anxious to perhaps promote the child and please them that we might give perhaps a more favourable report than the inspector would; but certainly the inspector's examination was always a very great stimulus to the children in the school.

15426. On the other hand, did it not very often act adversely on the weaker vessels among the children?—Well, no, because we were not deprived or prevented from promoting the children no matter even whether they passed the inspector or not. I had power to promote a child, and often did, because I thought that that child did not perhaps show up to what he actually knew at the examination.

15427. With regard to the promotion of children, is the general rule in your school to keep any considerable proportion back in the same standard for two years?—Not very many. Of course, there are some, but the proportion is not great.

15428. Would it amount to 10 per cent?—Well, it sometimes might; sometimes it would not be anything like that.

15429. Now, you mentioned the observation book. I want you to tell me do the teachers find the observation book useful?—I do not think so.

15430. Can you give me any idea of what the attitude of the majority of the teachers you know is to the observation book?—Well, we generally find that the suggestions are of very little use or of very little con-

sequence; that the inspector, for instance, reports, as has been done in my own observation book, "Reading is capable of improvement." Now, I know that it is capable of improvement; unless they came up to be able to recite like some great actor it is capable of improvement. Such things as that are written. Another inspector reports, "Attend to the position of the children take when writing, attend to the way they hold the pen." Now, I like to see the children, for health's sake, sitting upright, and what use is a suggestion like that to me?

15431. Yes, but my point was not the suggestions the inspectors make to you, but whether the teachers complain of entries being made in a book at the school. Some people represent to us that the observation book is useful to the teachers and useful to the inspectors, and that it is useful to the managers. (I may say at once that the principle is new to me, we have nothing of the sort in England)—If I was asked about another method, I think I could suggest a better one; but as far as I know the feeling of the teachers, when the inspector leaves there is a little bit perhaps of heart-burning or annoyance caused by the observation book, and when the teacher puts it into the press he never looks at it until the next time he is asked to produce it.

15432. In fact the main use is for the succeeding inspector?—Yes; but we hold that the succeeding inspector should make his report on what he finds in the school, and not on what was previously put in the observation book.

15433. Now, how would you like this plan, that when a junior inspector visits the school he should hand a copy of his notes to the senior inspector and the teacher of that school instead of putting it in the observation book?—Well, you see, we have not had senior and junior inspectors until comparatively recently. The district inspector examines the school, and I do not know much about that plan, but I think if the inspector wrote his observations on paper and made an exact copy by means of carbon paper and one copy was left in the school and the other copy was sent to the Board the teachers would be satisfied.

15434. But you hardly want a report to the Board of one of these incidental visits?—I suppose not; but I am sorry to say we do not always trust our inspectors, and we have not reason to trust them, and I will be able to give you examples after a bit if you like.

15435. I think I need not trouble you to do that, I think this book here is very full of evidence on that point?—The only reason I mention it was that Mr. House in his observations refers to his report of his visit of 20th October, 1910, beginning "I again reported on the school," and then gives his remarks under different heads, 1, 2, and 3, and when I come to show you that you will find that it is not the same as in the observation book.

15436. Not the same?—Nothing like the same.

15437. But then was it written on the same visit?—Oh, yes, that is supposed to be copied from the observation book.

15438. Then it comes to this, that a man has to make his observations on the spot at the moment?—Oh, yes.

15439. But his report is made under due consideration, when he is perfectly calm in his own study?—That is so. I mean in this case that there is a put down at page 180* in this book. First there are the observations of Mr. Dewar, then Mr. Kelly, then Mr. House, and then Mr. Lovell. It is near the end of page 180.

15440. "I again reported on the school on the 20th of October, 1910." Is that it?—Yes, that is it. What I meant was that I referred to that in my own statement, and I thought it had some bearing on the question you gave me.

15441. The point of my question was whether you found that the remarks in the observation book sometimes failed to tally with those in the report that came down from the Commissioners?—Well, I suppose it is not pertinent to that exactly, but we will go over it afterwards.

* Vide Appendix VIII.

27th June, 1913.]

Mr. C. H. Tate, examined.

[Continued.]

15442. Do you get the full report every year?—Do you mean from the Commissioners?

15443. Yes?—No, we get extracts from the report.

15444. Extracts from the full report?—Yes, I expect so.

15445. As well as from the reports of incidental visits?—Well, perhaps I can explain it better. The inspector comes in for the annual inspection or examination (that is not the incidental visit), and he writes what he wishes in the observation book. After some time, varying perhaps from three weeks to several months, a minute is sent down from the Education Office headed "Extracts from the Annual Report."

15446. It is not a separate report; I thought that there was a separate report sometimes of the result of an incidental visit?—No, we never get that unless there is something really wrong.

15447. The Chairman.—There are no reports of incidental visits in that book of yours?—No.

15448. Mr. HARRISON.—Now, you complain a good deal of changes of inspectors, and, of course, as all inspectors are human they each have their own individual idiosyncrasies and I suppose you find that rather troublesome to teachers, having a new man every year?—I do not think I ever complained.

15449. But on the teachers' evidence generally there are a good many complaints, and it is said that in five years you might have five different men?—I understand that, for I have had nearly always a different inspector each year.

15450. And you find that that has considerable disadvantages?—Well, it has in one year, perhaps, and not in another. I never mind if I get a fair inspector whether it is a different man or not.

15451. But still a man is more likely to be able to pronounce a sober judgment on a school if he knows something about it?—I think it would be better for the inspector if he did make a number of inspections. He would see the true state of affairs in the school.

15452. Occasionally one sees after a year or two some reason for changing one's opinion of a school on more intimate acquaintance with it, it may be for the better, it may be for the worse?—Yes, it may be.

15453. Now, you spoke about science teaching. I want to know how far science teaching is general. I understood that there was an attempt made to get it into all schools where it could possibly be taught after 1903?—That is so.

15454. But it was found that owing to the expense of equipment, and to the want of capacity among many of the teachers that it would not produce any good results?—I believe that was stated.

15455. But it is almost enough?—Yes, I think the lower class teachers did not know much about science.

15456. And I might go further and say that it wants a very highly trained man (indeed to make science interesting to young children, and it wants a man to know how to handle apparatus?—Yes.

15457. I understood that what may be called nature study generally was substituted in those schools for science?—Yes, that is so in a good many schools.

15458. What do you consider to be the true way of dealing with these nature study lessons?—Well, I have not introduced nature study.

15459. You have not?—No.

15460. You confine yourself to elementary science?—Yes.

15461. What, roughly, is your course?—It is what is called the official course.

15462. Effectively to carry that out means that not only you yourself, but all your teachers, must have a considerable knowledge of science, and be able to carry out experiments effectively, does it not?—Well, it is supposed to be that, there is no doubt.

15463. But very few schools can comply with these demands?—Well, we have not sufficient apparatus, we have not got a good place to teach it.

15464. And can you find the people who are sufficiently trained to do it?—Well, I do not know about that; but then I can speak for myself. I taught science under the Science and Art Department for a number of years; I attended two full courses in South Kensington; I have first-class honours in Sound, Light, and Heat. I taught electricity and magnetism, and I wrote nearly all the mathematics and science in the "Teachers' Journal" for two years. I taught quite a number of subjects—agriculture and geology.

15465. I do not wish in the least to question your capacity; but you cannot be responsible for teaching science throughout your school?—I cannot, but I think I told you yesterday what I did. I brought my teachers together and made experiments as well as I could, and I gave them a sort of lesson in the evenings. I was quite enthusiastic at the time that science was introduced, but I find now that the present programme is of precious little use; it is, in fact, of no use whatever.

15466. Were you not aware of that when you first read the programme?—I was not.

15467. But, at any rate, when you came to pluck the fruit you did not find that it was ripe?—I did not.

15468. I suppose you will allow that, that the real aim of science teaching is to train the powers of observation in the children?—Yes, I believe that.

15469. And not to give them snippets of scientific knowledge?—Well, that is what it is.

15470. And that any scheme to be effective must aim at training those powers?—Yes.

15471. Now, with regard to the teachers' expenses. Can you give me any instances from your own personal experience where expenses have been incurred by teachers?—Expenses in the upkeep of the school?

15472. Yes, such as the provision of apparatus or anything of that sort?—I can give you my own if you wish.

15473. What amount would the manager of your school contribute annually to the upkeep?—He does not contribute anything.

15474. Has he ever during your tenure of office contributed anything?—My present manager has not.

15475. How many years has he been manager?—Over 20 years.

15476. May I take it that in 20 years not one penny has been contributed to the upkeep of your school?—Not by the manager.

15477. Not by his representatives in any way?—Nor by his representatives. Kindly allow me to qualify it. I was Secretary of the School Vestry for over 30 years, and I had a peculiar hold over the people. I had not, therefore, so much difficulty in raising the money at all. For instance, some structural improvements were wanted. We got two little classrooms fixed, and in that case I ran an excursion to Dublin, and another to Stranraer and another to Derry, and out of the proceeds of those excursions I was able to pay for the greater part of the expense for the classrooms. You understand that it did not come directly out of my pocket at all. I may have given a subscription like any other member of the congregation.

15478. But directly from the manager you had nothing?—No.

15479. Did he help you in getting up these paying excursions?—Well, he helped me by paying his share.

15480. To that extent he contributed?—Yes, one ticket.

15481. Mr. HANLY.—Is your school one of those in which the teacher has a pecuniary interest in the structure himself?—Oh, none whatever.

15482. Mr. HARRISON.—If you will kindly turn to the observations of Mr. Dewar in the Observations of the Inspectors you will see there that Mr. Dewar himself gives figures that show a terrible amount of overcrowding in your school. Are those figures correct?—Those figures are perfectly correct.

15483. "At one period the moultress had charge of 60 infants at a reading lesson in a room 13½ feet by 10½ feet"—That is quite possible, I do not know it definitely.

15484. But you have no reason to suppose that that is not correct?—I have not.

15485. Now, this room contains, roughly, 130 superficial feet?—I suppose something about that.

15486. Therefore, there ought not to be more than 18 children in it?—I think, perhaps, your multiplication is not exactly right.

15487. That is to say that there were 66 children in a room which would accommodate 18?—That may be. That is quite possible.

15488. And then in another case the assistant mistress had 60 children at an object lesson in a room 12½ feet by 15½?—Well, the assistant denies that. I was not present. She denies that.

15489. What does she say?—She says there were only 55.

15490. We will even put it at 65. That is 66 children in a room that would accommodate 26½?—Yes.

15491. Well, is that usual?—Well, I am not responsible for the state of the building.

15492. I am not going into the question of your personal responsibility, but is not that a violation of the regulations to put so many children into the room?—Yes, but at one time the Board said six square feet were to be allowed in a classroom.

15493. But this was in 1910, was it not?—Yes.

15494. The CHAIRMAN.—They have raised their requirements?—They have raised their requirements two or three times.

15495. Mr. HARRISON.—But they have not raised their requirements since 1907?—No.

15496. Then the requirements were 10 square feet at the time these children were put into this room.

Mr. HARRISON.—They never made any regulation. All that was done was this. They asked the teacher to fill up a report at the end of the year and give the area of the room space and divide it by 10.

15497. Mr. HARRISON.—I am taking the facts as they were. Well, if it was not in direct violation of the regulations, I suppose you will admit that it is in direct violation of every sanitary rule?—Well, Mr. Harrison, I may tell you that I instituted certain ventilation in this classroom. I invented a certain thing of my own for carrying a current of air right through into this classroom after, I suppose, what is called Tobin's method, and I also got a ventilator that I was able to buy in connection with a church that was burned down. The ventilator was not injured, and I was able to get it very cheap, and I put it on the top of this classroom.

15498. Mr. HARRISON.—I trust that your experiments in ventilation were more successful than those adopted by the House of Commons?—I may tell you that Dr. Bailey, who is over the whole sanitary arrangements and everything of that kind in Belfast, visited the school, and said the ventilation was fairly good in this very classroom.

15499. But did he say that the ventilation was sufficient for such packing of children as that, putting 66 children in a classroom which would only accommodate 26, or even worse, in one that would only accommodate 18?

15500. The CHAIRMAN.—How was it physically possible?—There are galleries in each room, and the children are changed at the end of each lesson.

15501. Mr. HARRISON.—I confess that when I saw these figures I was horrified?—But remember I was not there, and there was a teacher present.

15502. But are you able to tell me that this was an absolutely exceptional case?—Certainly.

15503. That such a thing never occurs when you are present?—It never occurs when the whole staff is present, but if a teacher, for instance, is absent.

15504. It may occur if a teacher is absent?—Yes, it might occur.

15505. But, of course, any progress is absolutely impossible under such conditions?—But Mr. Dewar did state that at the time that these children were in this classroom. Where he speaks about a big lot of children it was at the roll call, and those children are on the rolls and they have to be called.

15506. He said distinctly at a reading lesson in the first place and afterwards at an object lesson?—Yes, but the teacher denies that about the object lesson.

15507. I am quite content to take her figure, because it will reduce the number to 66, but even that is horrible?—If I had been present in the school I would be one of the teachers, and there would not have been so many as 66 infants in the classroom at all, but the teachers had to work as best they could when I was absent. I was with Dr. Traill on a deputation.

15508. But surely there was some other place to which they could have been taken than a room that would accommodate 18, a room that would not be recognised for accommodating anybody under the English system?—But you can hardly judge schools in Ireland by the English system.

15509. I am not judging by any high standard, but merely by the most elementary rules?—Yes.

15510. Surely no progress, no work that was worth anything, could be done under such circumstances. Might it not account for what we have heard of the language of the assistant mistresses who are employed?—I do not think so, sir.

15511. If a woman has to work under such horrible conditions as that would it not account for it?—Not if a woman has to work in our school, and gets paid to do it, and is not in terror of some inspector. She would not then have that haggard appearance or that wasted appearance.

15512. Would not the mere fact of having to work under the conditions given here be sufficient to induce a very languid appearance?—It would, but this is an exceptional case you see.

15513. I hope it is, because it strikes me as a perfectly horrible case?—Well, now, Mr. Harrison, will you excuse me, allow me to qualify that. I say in my rejoinder, if you look at it that on that day I had a new assistant in the school, an assistant who was just appointed, and had only been in the school about two or three days, and she did not know even the names of the pupils of her class.

15514. But are you able definitely to assure me that this sort of thing never does occur when you are present?—It never does unless at the moment, at the time the children are getting their roll marked.

15515. But even then if you put them in for five minutes they will roll the air, so that no class ought to go into it for the rest of the morning?—But we have sprays to purify the air in Belfast schools, and I spray the school constantly, or get it sprayed.

Mr. KERR.—Mr. Homan says—"Mr. Todd alleges" that the lady teachers are suffering in health from the oppression of the inspectors. His statement is untrue. If any of them suffer from overwork it is due to the action of principal teachers like Mr. Todd, who gives one lady teacher sole charge of 160 pupils. At my inspection in November, 1909, 294 pupils were present. The infants, who were in sole charge of one teacher, formed practically one-third of the whole school, and were taught in a room 17½ feet by 15 feet."

15516. Mr. HARRISON.—We have got the reply to that?—I don't think we actually went much into it.

15517. Then will you answer that question?—With regard to that first paragraph at page 155 in the appendix to the report of this Committee, all I can say is, if the teacher has sole charge of 160 pupils, that is, if the teacher has sole charge of 160 pupils, that is a matter that the Board is responsible for. It is responsible in this way, that we are asked year by year in our annual report at the time of the inspection who has charge of the classes in school. I put down, of course, the assistant who has principal charge of the infants. Her name is down as having charge of the infants. The first standard, then, is put down to the teacher who has the principal charge of that, and so on. "Mr. Todd's share of the work," he says, consisted in teaching the extra standard. Now, every person knows that the principal teacher has far more than one class to teach if he has only such a small staff. And then he says, "only 15 being on the roll." Twelve of those children were present on one day, and eleven on another, and it is misleading to say that only so many were on the roll. We do not keep a number of children on the roll that are not in attendance.

* Vide Appendix VIII.

15517. I put the question in this way. What have you to say to the fact of one lady teacher having sole charge of 100 pupils in attendance, according to the statement of Mr. HARRISON?—What I have to say is, that one teacher simply has not charge of 100 children.

15518. What help has she?—Classes are amalgamated for needlework, or for other subjects like that. Where classes were amalgamated another assistant is sent to help her.

15519. Would she teach that class of 100 in reading?—She would not.

15520. Without help?—She could not do it.

15521. Whose help would she have?—She would have the help of another assistant whose class had gone to another teacher. In National Schools we have often to amalgamate classes, for instance, in needlework. More than half of my school consists of girls. Well, in needlework one teacher will have two or three classes at needlework. Well, when two or three classes are at needlework that acts free an assistant or two assistants, because I take all the senior boys at needlework time for arithmetic, and it is on the time-table.

15522. But the question is, how far that statement is inaccurate that she has sole charge of 100 pupils?—I say it is inaccurate this way.

15523. She gets occasional help from teachers who are released when their classes are taking needlework. What other help does she get?—There are a number of monitories in the school and she can get some.

15524. Would she take them, for instance, in writing?—She would not.

15525. She would always have an assistant?—She would always have some person.

15526. Would that be another teacher or a monitor?—It might be another teacher, or it might be a monitor, an unpaid monitor; we have not any paid monitories.

15527. Would you count an unpaid monitor as of any value?—Oh, yes, a very senior girl is very useful.

15528. It might be a very senior girl?—Yes.

15529. Then your explanation of that is that the school generally have help?—Yes. Then she has a sort of supervision over the others.

15530. And then you say that the sole charge would seem supervision over the 100?—That would be more like it.

15531. But you deny that she has ever taken it as a class?—Yes, that is so; I deny that.

15532. Can you tell me how many children there are in Belfast who cannot find room in schools?—Well, I saw a statement by, I think, the Bishop, that I think there were 15,000 children.

The CHAIRMAN.—They have enlarged that number since; they have gone over 15,000.

Mr. HARRISON.—Somebody has stated here 20,000.

15533. Mr. HARRISON.—That there are 20,000 children who cannot find school places in Belfast?—I think the Bishop of Down and Connor and Dromore said that.

15534. And many you refuse, of course?—One day I had to refuse 20 pupils.

15535. It means that you must have terrible overcrowding?—At one time there was no restriction, or very little restriction, on the teachers.

15536. The CHAIRMAN.—You told me yesterday that the numbers were reduced?—Yes.

15537. Mr. HARRISON.—Then in those days your schools were horribly unsanitary?—Well, my schools were ventilated as well as could possibly be.

15538. But even with the best ventilation in the world?—Oh, they are not what they ought to be, we must admit that.

15539. The CHAIRMAN.—That day is over?—That day is over.

15540. Mr. HARRISON.—Then it appears that the present machinery for providing school places in Belfast has hopelessly broken down?—That is so. Mr. Kelly, in one of his reports furnished to the Commissioners of National Education (I cannot exactly remember the words he uses), says that if it was not for the efforts of the teachers he would have to record the bankruptcy of primary education in Belfast.

15541. The Bazaar or Bazaar.—In reference to the answers you have just made to Mr. Harrison about the want of school accommodation in Belfast, I think I saw a statement in connection with the statistics of Catholics in Belfast that they had more than sufficient accommodation for the Catholic children. Do you happen to know anything on that subject?—I saw that statement, my lord.

15542. And as far as your knowledge or information goes you have no reason to doubt that statement?—I have not.

15543. So, therefore, the want of school accommodation is on the part of the Church and Presbyterian congregations?—That is as far as I know.

15544. And also, I suppose, it is a pretty well known fact that, taking the Catholic population in general, they are the poorer portion of the population of Belfast?—That is so, my lord.

15545. And they have provided themselves with sufficient schools so far as we know?—Yes.

15546. Now, you were discussing the upkeep of the schools, and you told us that the teachers frequently had to go to the congregations and try to raise the necessary funds for the upkeep of the school, so that the teachers have to do what in ordinary circumstances the manager, who is usually the clergyman of the congregation, ought to do?—That is so, my lord.

15547. And, therefore, you get the duty and the burden, and might I add, the privilege of seeing what the clergyman ought to do?—My lord, I never objected personally to it myself.

15548. On the same point, have you any information as to what the condition of the Catholic schools in Belfast is as to their upkeep and equipment?—I do not think I could answer that generally. I heard from one teacher that he never had a penny to spend on the school. I heard that from Mr. Kerr, the principal of St. Matthew's School, Ballymacarrett.

15549. And as far as you know, you do not find the same complaint among the Catholic teachers as among your own body?—We do not. I have not accurate knowledge.

15550. But you have not heard complaints on the part of Catholic teachers in the same way as on the part of others that you have mentioned, anything like to the same extent or in the same way. According to the regulations of the Board the equipment and repair of the school should be taken into consideration in the assigning of the merit mark of the school. Is not that so?—That is so.

15551. Well, some of the teachers interpret that rule as meaning that these things are taken into consideration as against the teacher, and that they have the effect of lowering the merit mark?—That is so, my lord.

15552. Now, it was given in evidence before us that the rule was intended to have the very opposite effect, and in point of fact that it has the very opposite effect.

Mr. DUNNORTH, the Secretary, in answer to questions 280 and 281, and to some other questions, also laid down the same thing, but I merely refer to these. In substance, he points out in his replies to those questions that where a school is poorly equipped, and in a bad state of repair, and the children show a certain amount of proficiency, the school would get a higher mark than a school in which the children showed equal proficiency, but where the school buildings were in a good state of repair and equipment. Of course, a teacher who has ascended to a high level in a badly equipped school is a more deserving man than a man who had done the same work in a well equipped school. That doctrine has been repeated by Mr. McNeill and a number of witnesses. In the face of that evidence, do you still hold to the answer you made to the Chairman, that you think the other is the correct view?—I do.

15553. Now, I gather from you that when the trouble arose in Belfast the teachers were not in favour of the chief inspectors going down to re-examine the schools?—No, we did not know anything about that until they came.

15554. And if the teachers had been consulted they would not have agreed?—They would have objected.

17th June, 1913.]

Mr. C. H. Tonn, examined.

[Continued.]

15555. And they were not satisfied with the result of the chief inspector's visits—They looked upon it as a farce.

15556. Now, amongst the duties of the chief inspectors, as far as we gather, they have two principal duties. One is to try to keep up uniformity in the various districts by moving round the country, one of them having one half of Ireland and the other the other half. The second duty is that in case of trouble they will go and re-inspect the schools. Well, according to the Belfast teachers that second duty cannot be performed, because, remember, your position was that a chief inspector was interested in the case himself?—Yes.

15557. And if there was a breakdown it was an admission that he was more or less compromised. Is not that so?—That is so.

15558. Will not that hold in every case the same as in the Belfast case—the two chief inspectors are responsible for all Ireland?—They are.

15559. So, therefore, should I be justified in drawing the conclusion that in your view the chief inspectors could not be sent to re-inspect in any case of trouble of this kind?—Yes, up to the present, of course, under the present system.

15560. So, therefore, they should be excluded from that, and wherever trouble arises it has got to be dealt with in some other way?—Yes.

15561. I think you told us that the idea of the teachers in Belfast was that a special inspector should go down to Belfast?—Yes.

15562. And that he should stop in a special hotel, and that he should be prevented from making any inquiry about the schools, and that the teachers should be prevented from giving him any information, and also that he should spend a day in each school; and did I gather rightly that he was to get notification in the morning of what school he was to go to inspect on that particular day?—Yes.

15563. And then that he was to spend a day in the school and to go back to his hotel again, and this was to go on, and there were 111 schools to be examined or inspected or dealt with?—There is a little difference in that. I did not mean 111, but there might be, perhaps, 111. What I meant was that there were a certain number that were not reduced, and he was not to know which schools were reduced and which were not reduced.

15564. But he was to examine and inspect the entire of the schools?—He was to go to a certain number that were not reduced, and a certain number that were, and he was not to know about one or the other.

15565. He was to get such a number of schools, and I suppose not less than 100 schools would satisfy you?—Well, we did not go into the number that he should inspect. I suppose it would be as many as the Commissioners would be inclined to give him; the more the better, you see.

15566. But then he would be occupied, suppose, for 90 days in this business between schools that were reduced and those that were not, between schools that were in trouble and other schools that were not in trouble?—Yes, but I do not think I said that he was to spend a whole day in the school. He might have gone to two schools or more in the one day. If I said that I did not mean that.

15567. But this inspector would be a considerable time?—He would, of course.

15568. In what I might venture to say would almost be dancing round, pretty much like a juryman looked up for the night?—But I think if the Commissioners wanted to satisfy the teachers they should have taken every opportunity to circumscribe him round, so that he would have very little communication with other inspectors.

15569. You also gave us your view that in case of inquiries or appeals you would require a sworn examination. That would be your wish?—Well, the teachers of Belfast, I suppose, would prefer it.

15570. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—As I was referred to on that subject and expressed a strong opinion against it, I wish to mention our reason. To enable them to hold a sworn investigation an Act of

Parliament would be required, and I do not suppose that you would ask that an Act of Parliament should be passed for that purpose?—Of course, I did not know.

15571. The Hon. Mr. ROSS.—The point I am leading up to is this. The teachers complain, and as far as I know with at least some ground, that the inspectors show towards them distrust and want of confidence. You complain of that?—I do.

15572. Now, what is concerning to me, as a man looking into human nature, is that distrust breeds distrust, and when the teachers demand such peculiar proceedings do they not show considerable distrust of inspectors?—Yes, I believe, but you must remember, my lord, that previous to this there were always very nice relations existing between the inspectors and the teachers, and we found them always very friendly, and in my statement I will give you an example of how an inspector trusted myself.

Well, it is my desire, and I am sure it would be the desire of the Committee, that there should be mutual trust between both parties.

15573. Mr. KAVANAGH.—You told us that you believed that the lowering of the marks in the Belfast district was due to direct instructions from the Board. Why do you think that?—Of course, I have no direct evidence to that effect; I simply reasoned the matter out. It was I who stated that before Dr. Starke. I say this, that there was certainly an almost universal saying that in the administration of the office was right say that if the administration of the office was right they would have seen up in the Education Office that this great lowering was continuing, and they should have made some inquiry to know how it was that the teachers in Belfast were becoming so inefficient. That is my answer to that question.

15574. But it is hardly an answer to the question. The question I asked you was when you made a charge against the Board of giving deliberate instructions that the marks should be lowered why did you think so?—Well it was a matter of common talk in Belfast that some inspectors had stated that there were instructions, that the senior inspectors had got instructions, and by word of mouth had communicated it to the juniors.

15575. They have absolutely denied that?—I know that.

15576. What possible object could the Board have in giving these instructions?—Well I should think that in Belfast, as the school buildings were very inferior, they probably wanted to try to get the managers to improve them, and you see that was confirmed, as far as I am concerned, by what Mr. Homan stated on a certain date. I think I told you that yesterday.

15577. Do you mean that they actually did injustice to the teachers in order to bring pressure to bear on the managers? Yes, I believe that, because it was stated again and again, and perhaps Mr. Boyd will give you the name of the person who said that they could not touch the managers direct, but they could touch the managers through the teachers. I believe Mr. Boyd will be able to give you the authority.

15578. But they could denounce the managers, but all will admit that that would be a very exceptional thing?—And they would not do it without some tremendous reason. In fact I only know in Belfast of one manager who was denounced. I cannot recall any more at the present moment. I know one who was denounced.

15579. Mr. HENRY.—And I suppose you know that power has been only very recently exercised?—I know that.

15580. Of course, there was one case, the Father O'Reilly case; that was an old case, and it was very exceptional?—Yes, but that is not the case I refer to.

15581. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Well, now, do you know that the lowering of the marks did bring the pressure on the managers that the Board thought it would?—I do not think so.

15582. Do you really think that the Board ever thought it would?—Well I think they were determined to have better schools some way, and that was one of the reasons.

15583. And the way they did it was to penalise the teachers?—Yes.

27th June, 1913.]

Mr. C. H. Toss, examined.

[Continued.]

15586. But I cannot believe that. You surprised me very much by stating that some of the schools were part owned by teachers in Belfast?—No, I do not think I said that. I said that in some cases they were entirely owned. I do not think a teacher would have a part ownership. There is a difference between being partly owned and entirely owned.

15587. I thought that in answer to Mr. Harrison you said you knew of some schools which were part owned by teachers?—I never intended that. I said entirely. The school was built by a teacher and owned by a teacher.

15588. Is there a manager?—Oh, certainly there must be a manager.

Mr. HENLEY.—Here we find in the Commissioners' own blue book that Mr. Kelly says that a case came under his notice where there was reason to believe that the teacher was the owner of the schoolhouse; so they have official knowledge.

15587. Mr. KAVANAGH.—There is a manager?—Oh, there is a manager.

15588. The CHAIRMAN.—The teacher appoints that manager?—Yes.

15589. Mr. KAVANAGH.—He appoints the manager?—Of course, I only have this by hearsay. In that case the teacher would be bound to appoint the manager.

15590. And the manager would be bound to appoint the teacher?—He appoints the teacher.

15591. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Could the manager dismiss the teacher?—I think that before that would occur probably the teacher would manage to get rid of the manager.

15592. Who owns your school?—It belongs to the congregation altogether. It was built on ground granted by Lord Templemore for a school and church. In the case of a manager clergyman dying his successor is appointed by the Board.

15593. The Rector of the parish?—He is Rector of the parish, and he is ex-officio manager owing to his position.

15594. Now to come to the tone circular, we have been getting opinions from inspectors and managers, and I should like to ask you as a teacher what is your opinion of the tone circular?—Well, I will tell you this much, that at our meetings it has caused a good deal of fun; it is simply laughed at, because some teachers will tell you that when inspectors talk about tone they will take into account the position of children when writing, the way they hold the pen, and various things like that. I know one case of a school where the inspector admits that the discipline of the Third and Fourth Standards is excellent, but the tone is not right. Well, we are not able to define tone ourselves; we do not know what is meant by tone.

15595. And you would not like to venture a definition of tone?—I would not indeed.

15596. But do you not think that the circular has improved the general appearance and condition of the schools?—Well I cannot answer that for this reason, that I am not often now in any other schools. Formerly I used, on my holidays, to visit other schools, but I have not done so for years; but speaking for my own school, it is not one bit cleaner or tidier than ever it was. Since I started the school as principal teacher I always kept the school as it ought to be. For my own satisfaction I would not like to work in an untidy or dirty building.

15597. Is the School Attendance Act in force in Belfast?—Yes.

15598. Well what is the use of it if you have not school accommodation?—I suppose it works in this way, that they will look after those children whose names are on the roll, but it is of very little consequence in parts of Belfast, as my wife. I am sorry that I did not think of bringing a statement prepared by the Belfast teachers in answer to the report of the Attendance Committee, and if you like I will send it to you.

15599. If you have not got the school accommodation what is the use of having the School Attendance Act?—It is of very little use in Belfast.

15600. You say parents take great interest in examinations?—Yes.

15601. You said that if the examination was brought back they would look to their children attending better?

—Well, they look forward to an examination. I frequently hear parents say, "Will my boy pass this time?" "Is he to be examined by the inspector?" "Is he ready?" especially those that were in schools themselves in the former days.

15602. Mr. HARRISON.—You have told us that you would not have individual examination?—Yes, in some subjects.

15603. And that you would not think bringing back that an advantage?—It would be class examination in most subjects.

15604. Then no parent would know how his child did?—No parent knows any more at the time of the results, unless we told him.

15605. Unless the teacher told him?—Yes.

15606. Mr. HARRISON.—It was definitely recorded?—It was.

15607. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Individual examination of each pupil does not exist now?—There is no record now kept.

15608. There is no way that a parent could know how his child was going on?—No, he cannot unless we sent a report to each child, and that would mean expense.

15609. Do you think education has improved since the results system was abolished?—No; to my mind it has gone back. A great many of my children are employed in offices, and in one place or another in Belfast—I mean former pupils; and those employees now tell me that children do not come to them for situations as well prepared as they were formerly.

15610. You expected composition?—I did, sir; that was the one exception. I hear some teachers say that reading might be better, but I always dwell on reading myself.

15611. Mr. KAVANAGH.—It is claimed that the present system develops the intelligence of the children more. Do you think it is as good for them in after life?—The intelligence is not less.

15612. But you have actually heard from employees that children are not as well educated now as they were?—Again and again I have heard that.

15613. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—I believe that you have said that you wish to put in a reply to the inspector's observations?—That is so.

15614. You will put that in?—I will.

15615. I see in that that you state that there was a census taken. When you are speaking of that you refer to what is afterwards stated under No. 17?—That is so, the result of the census taken.

15616. This gives your views of the statements made by the chief inspectors. That is a joint expression on the part of the Committee?—Yes, our Committee.

15617. Then No. 3 is your reply to the chief inspectors and to Messrs. Dewar, Horan and Weply?—Yes.

15618. That is what appears there under No. 3?—That is written by myself.

15619. And you said that you wanted to refer particularly to that?—I do.

15620. Now Mr. Larmour replies to Messrs. Mangan, Weply and Kelly, and Mr. Boyd replies to Mr. Dewar and Mr. McMillan?—Yes, that was written by Mr. Boyd.

15621. Mr. Larmour also writes a reply?—Yes.

15622. Mr. McCluggage replies to Mr. Kelly?—Yes, and he will likely be a witness here.

15623. Then Mr. Thomson?—Then Mr. Thomson unfortunately for us is dead.

15624. The CHAIRMAN.—What school was he in?—Ben Memorial. He would have been the best witness we could possibly have brought from Belfast. He died on the anniversary of the day that we were up with Dr. Starke.

15625. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—He wrote a rejoinder to the Board's reply to the memorial of the teachers?—Yes.

15626. That is all that appears in this book, and you put that in?—Yes, if you please.

15627. Before turning to your own reply. You indicated that there are some other documents that you wanted to put in. There is a list of schools you have already referred to?—Yes. I think Mr. Woodward presented that; if he did not I would wish to present it now.

* Vide Appendix XLVI.

15028. You mentioned something, and I think Mr. Woodward mentions something about extending this list—Well we can, but we thought that we would be before the Committee at once, and we had not them all down; we did not put all the schools that we got, but we can do that if you wish.

15029. You may wish to give a fuller statement, including those and others which we have not got yet?—Yes. The teachers supplied us with forms.

15030. Well what other statements would you like to present to the Committee?—Well, "Inspection and Reports of National Schools." That was prepared by the Belfast National Teachers' Association. I will put in a copy of that. There is also another one—National Education, Inspection of Schools and Promotion of Teachers, Exposure of the Present System." I wish to present that.

15031. The CHAIRMAN.—That proceeds from the Protestant teachers?—No.

15032. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—You will understand that these are put in subject to the universal rule that the Committee or the chairman determine how much of these are to be printed?—Oh, certainly.

15033. And if there is anything which you wish particularly to have printed you might submit that for the consideration of the Committee, and in the meantime you put these in for the information of the Committee?—Yes.

The CHAIRMAN.—The proper course is to send it up by one of your brother teachers who will be coming in the next month.

15034. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—It will be for you to point out the parts you consider material?—Yes, I understand.

15035. You should state any part of these documents you wish put in which you and other teachers consider desirable to be printed or as answers to the statements made before us?—There is the Irish Protestant National Teachers' Annual for 1910. That contains the story of an investigation held by Mr. Dewar in which I was one of the principal teachers. There is part of it that refers to that case.

15036. You say that you wish to put in the President's address of the Protestant Teachers' Union of the 15th of June, 1910?—Yes.

15037. Now is there any other document that at the moment you wish to put in?—I wish to put in my statement at the end.

15038. Now, do you wish to deal with the statements made by the chief inspectors and the other inspectors, and to call attention to that part of your reply to which you think our attention ought specially to be called?—Yes.

15039. Would you just take your own order if you wish to refer to those things?—Well, you will see in the blue book there, page 169, you have Mr. Honan's remarks. Well, I wish to hand in some papers with regard to the rigorous and to make a statement thereof.

15040. Would you refer more particularly to the statement made by Mr. Honan so that one may quite understand it?—Yes; Mr. Honan begins by saying with reference to his examining in mathematics—I do not mind about the examination as a whole itself but Mr. Honan makes a charge—

15041. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—He says: "If Mr. Todd believed he had a grievance, he would very soon have appealed to the Board. He states, 'The Inspector could not have been brought to admit his fault.' Well, I now admit my fault. It was over-lenient in selecting the easiest questions and practically submitting them to Mr. Todd, whose notions of honour and candour are brought to light by the gruelled and misleading version he gives. I never said I would add 20 to the percentage obtained by the pupils." That is what you refer to?—Yes, and also I wish to refer to where at the very top of the page he gives certain tables. I want to show that Mr. Honan, if I may do it, had falsified these and then blames me for them.

15042. The CHAIRMAN.—I understand that you teachers claim to amplify your rejoinder?—Oh, yes.

15043. You think the rejoinder is not a sufficient reply to the inspectors?—It is not, because it was

hastily written. We thought we had only a day or so to do it in, and we were refused copies of the inspectors' replies.

15044. And then you are amplifying the rejoinder?—Slightly.

15045. Now, go on and rebut this?—Yes.

15046. You see the precise point?—I never said I would add 20 to the percentage obtained by the pupils?—I do not want to rebut that statement. Mr. Honan said distinctly that he would add 20 per cent, and he might have had one thing in his mind and I another, but the point I go on as this. You see "Second year, 144 correct out of 35" (that is at the very top of the page) "equals 41 per cent, and adding 20 per cent. to the answering," he goes on and shows I had only 50. What I mean to say is this, that Mr. Honan made his calculation wrong. There were seven pupils examined, and each child got five questions, which should have then been divided by 35, and instead of that he divided by 40, and got a smaller percentage than he should have had. When he was making his defense he knew that there were only 35. He knew that the percentage he gave was 42, and he changed the dividend from 37 to 14.5 to make that percentage, and I have his figures, which I am prepared to submit to the Committee.

15047. Mr. HIRSH.—Is that in amplification of what you state here?—I do not think it is so plain.

15048. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—I understood you to say that you have a paper in Mr. Honan's own handwriting, showing that the return in his answer to the Commissioners is not correct?—Yes, it is false.

15049. The CHAIRMAN.—Then you put that in?—Yes.

15050. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—What is the next point?—Well, Mr. Honan blasphemes my character by saying that he selected the easiest questions. I merely put what I hand them in. Now, he publishes my letter there in his statement at the end of his observations. I think you will see it on page 191. I want to hand in his letter and the Board's reply to the Secretary of our Association on the same subject.

15051. You wish to put in two letters? from Mr. Honan, dated the 15th of October, 1910. Is that so?—Yes, one from Mr. Honan, and there is a copy of the letter from the Board. The Secretary of the Association has the original.

15052. That is dated the 13th of July, 1911, and is orders to a letter of the 23rd of May. We have a copy of this letter, but it can be put in. This is the letter: "The pupils in this standard course answered 34 questions out of 45. . . . In both cases I gave the easiest questions, and in addition added 20 per cent. to the answering, so that it was only by cheating every point in your favour," etc.?—And then my statement showing that Mr. Honan made a wrong calculation.

15053. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—I believe you have a statement which you consider would shorten the inquiry if you were allowed to read it without interruption?—That is so, sir.

15054. Will you read it then, please?—I told you in my evidence that I had asked Mr. Dewar to come a second time to inspect my school. I appealed to him again in the presence of Mr. Singleton, Principal of the Ladley School. He again stated that he could tell the mark a school was called to in five minutes; that he could reduce a school from "excellent" to "bad" and say his prayers with a clear conscience; that he had started one day to come to my school but Satan had entered into him and that he had gone elsewhere; and in talking about teachers, he stated there were teachers who were not fit to sweep the streets. Mr. Dewar never showed any sympathy with teachers in their work, and he was cordially disliked by the majority of the teachers here over whom he was placed. He conducted an investigation in which I and the principals of two other schools were concerned, and it is our deliberate opinion that a more unbiassed investigation it would be impossible to conceive. I understood your Secretary has asked the Board for a copy of the proceedings, and that he has been supplied

+ Vide Appendix XLVIII.

+ Vide Appendix XLIX.

* Vide Appendix XLV.

by our Association with the report as presented by Mr. Elliott. Mr. Dewar acted as judge for the Commissioners, and as attorney for the manager, frequently using such expressions as "You are a very bad witness." "I'll drag it out of him." "You must answer Yes or No without any qualification." And on the second morning of my examination took me aside before I commenced to say, "This will be a very critical day for you"; and during the inquiry he stated that he had conducted an investigation in another part of Ireland, and the priest settled the question by dismissing the three teachers concerned. I could only look on it as a hint to the manager what he could and should do. To show that Mr. Dewar meant it as such, he met me on Christmas evening in Donegall Place, and asked if Mr. Moore and I had got our notice, and, as a matter of fact, we had been asked by the manager to send in our resignations. If you will kindly turn to "Observations of Mr. Homan," you will see that he says "that they do not apply to a very large number of teachers who have always done good work, and whose schools were always and are highly marked. They do not rank among the disqualified." Mr. Homan did not know anything about the teachers in his district when he wrote that, for disaffection is universal in Belfast as well as in the rest of Ireland. He applied the right term to himself when he spoke about an "echo," for that is just what he is of Mr. Dewar. Then there is just one point that I want to call your attention to, and I think that will newly fetch me. In page 190 of your blue book, half way down the page, first column, he says—"On the 26th of October, 1909, I again reported on the school" (an incidental visit for E.O.34), etc., down to "very good." The point I want to show is, and you will consider it is, that 1, 2 and 3 had been written as a report. What I want to say is this, that that was not a report; it is there in the Observation Book, E.O. 34. He excluded all the good points, and merely put in a few of the bad ones, and added on paragraph 3 that it is not either in the Observation Book or in the Report.

Mr. KERRIE.—You had better read out the first three paragraphs.

15066. The CHAIRMAN.—This is the report in the Observation Book:—"1. The work proceeded regularly with vigour, and on the whole intelligently. Order and discipline are very good, though at occasional times the pupils become somewhat noisy. 2. Writing is very carefully taught in all divisions. 3. In Standard I, let subtraction tables be taken with addition tables, and place values be taught by easy illustrations."—That is in the Observation Book, but it is not here at all.

15067. Those are left out?—Those are left, and those is a part here, you see, in the continuation of it—"In referring to my notes," etc. That does not appear in the Observation Book or in the Report.

15068. Mr. KERRIE.—But that does not purport to be an extract from the Observation Book?—But that is a serious reflection on me, that the 6th Standard taught by me knew nothing of roots, prefixes and affixes. My contention is that if that occurred Mr. Homan should have put it in the Observation Book. It is a serious reflection on my character as a teacher. Mr. Homan never asked a single prefix, root, or affix.

15069. The CHAIRMAN.—Those notes were not in the Observation Book?—Nor do they appear in the Report.

15070. Mr. KERRIE.—Mr. Todd says he did not ask questions about prefixes or affixes, and Mr. Homan said the class knew nothing about them?—That is so, and that never came out until Mr. Homan made his defence.

Mr. HARRISON.—It should be, "I reported 1 and 2, and on referring to my notes I also found those matters."

The CHAIRMAN.—Is not the effect of it that No. 3 appears in the Observation Book?

Mr. HENRY.—"Noted" would seem to imply that it was in the Observation Book.

Mr. HARRISON.—He means "referring to my notes," that is his own private notes.

Mr. HENRY.—I think nothing means entering in the Observation Book.

Mr. KERRIE.—The substantial thing is that he omits the favourable features of the school, and according to Mr. Todd he adds that about prefixes and roots and affixes, and Mr. Todd says he asked no question about that.

15081. Mr. HENRY WILKINSON.—And there is nothing about that in the Observation Book?—Or in the minutes that came down from the National Board. Excuse me, there would not be a minute for that; it is an incidental visit.

Mr. HENRY.—In connection with that nothing on the top 1, 2 and 3, there would be no sense in his saying that he made entries in his own private note-book.

15082. You don't see No. 3 at all?—Not until I saw this.

Mr. HARRISON.—The whole thing is absolutely clear. The result is that he is giving extracts out of his private note-book which are not in the Observation Book, and which are not in the minutes that come down.

The CHAIRMAN.—And what is the inference from that—that is the result to the teacher?

Mr. HARRISON.—Well, only that it is a statement which is very confused.

Mr. HENRY.—It is a supplementary charge.

The CHAIRMAN.—And it is, as I understand, a criticism of the teacher which the teacher never saw.

15083. Mr. HARRISON.—That is not fair, and I think it is a mistake altogether?—I do not like to be at all dogmatic, or anything like that, and what I mean to imply, and what I believe to be the truth, is that he never had that in his notes.

15084. The CHAIRMAN.—We cannot tell that?—My argument is that it is a severe censure on me.

15085. Mr. KERRIE.—The strong part of your case is the definite statement that he asked no questions about those roots, whatever they are?—There is just one point that I wanted to call attention to. Mr. Dewar, in his statement, said that Mr. Homan wrote that arithmetic was weak in 1st, 4th and 5th standards.

Mr. Dewar must have got this information from the Observation Book or from Mr. Homan. He does not mention 6th Standard. That is in page 285, fifteen lines from the bottom of the first column—"Arithmetic is weak in 1st, 4th and 5th standards." But a little further up Mr. Homan wrote in the Observation Book of this school that there were 322 pupils in infants and 1st class who had got no instruction in kindergarten; "And also writing is weak in 1st and 4th standards." I wish to refer to that because I have been accused. You see that Mr. Homan said that he had visited the school again and called attention to a report resulting from this visit. Now, that report means that I was accused to the Board of altering that Observation Book. I will show you the place.

15086. The CHAIRMAN.—Where he says it was rubbed?—Where he says it was rubbed, and that book was sent up to the Commissioners of National Education after Mr. Homan had made the statement that arithmetic was weak in the 1st, 4th and 5th standards.

15087. What was the word that was rubbed?—Mr. Homan says that "and sixth" was rubbed.

15088. Mr. HARRISON.—That was the 16th of November, 1909?—I reported the matter to Dr. Sturges immediately after Mr. Homan wrote that.

15089. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—That was sent up to the Board, and the Board having examined that, what did they say about it?—I wrote to the Board twice and I never got any reply.

15090. The CHAIRMAN.—Do you mean to say definitely that you appealed against that accusation?—I do.

15091. And they never replied?—And they never replied. They got the book up. Mr. Dewar came and took the book away, and it was kept in the Education Office for over two months.

15092. Will you state your complaint with regard to the criticism of Mr. Homan in the Observation Book on the 16th of November, 1909, and the charge of rubbing?—Yes. On the 16th and 17th of November Mr. Homan visited my school for the purpose of inspection. He wrote—"Arithmetic is weak in 1st, 4th and 5th standards." He came back on the 19th

7th June, 1913.]

Mr. C. H. Toot, examined.

[Continued.]

of January, 1910, read over this previous report, and never said anything about it. On the 29th of October, 1910, he did the same thing. On the 9th of March, 1911, he called, and he wrote in the Observation Book—"At noting 3, page 37, I noted and included 6th standard as being weak in arithmetic. Sixth does not appear now. The place shows an ink stain and rubbing. Mr. Todd does not know how it happened." Now, my contention is that Sixth never appeared in the Observation Book. I did not take any notice of the blot and rubbing at all, because there are a good many blots all over this old book; but that was a serious charge against me, that I tampered with any of the Board's records.

15673. Will you say what you did in consequence of this charge?—I wrote to Dr. Sharkey, complaining about Mr. Honan, on the 16th of the third month, 1911. The Board simply acknowledged the receipt of the letter.

15674. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Have you got a copy of your letter?—I have.

15675. Will you send it in?—I will.

15676. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, will you finish the reference to the National Board?—On the 31st of the 3rd month Mr. Dewar took the observation book and sent it to Dublin. It was returned on the 12th of June, 1911, without any answer or reply or anything. It was just simply returned.

15677. It was returned three months?—Yes, from the 31st of March till the 12th of June.

15678. Two and a half months?—Yes. On the 30th of August I wrote to Dr. Sharkey asking for the result of the investigation about the observation book and got no reply.

15679. That is the end of that?—That is the end of that incident.

15680. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—And have yet got no reply?—And have got no reply, and if it was believed that I was guilty, I would have been punished in some way or other.

15681. You may continue your statement?—I wish to call attention to Mr. Honan's report on my school.

15682. The CHAIRMAN.—You say you wish to call attention to that?—Yes. Mr. Honan said he gave "excellent" because there was no intermediate mark between "excellent" and "good." (Reads report.) You see one "good" there for kindergarten and manual instruction. I want to show how accurate Mr. Honan is. I got that "good" for a subject that we never introduced. No teacher was competent to teach it, and we had no apparatus to teach it with.

15683. That is from Mr. Honan?—That is from Mr. Honan.

15684. 1903?—Yes.

15685. He marked a non-existing subject?—He did.

15686. Mr. KERR.—What was the subject?—Kindergarten and Manual Instruction. In the report of 1903 Mr. Honan gave "good" for a subject that had not been introduced into the school, that I had no teacher competent to teach, and that I had no apparatus to teach with.

15687. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—And in all the other subjects he gave the marks "very good" and "excellent"?—"Very good" and "excellent." This is to show how inaccurate inspectors are. I recommended as far as I can the abolition of the merit marks both for schools and teachers. I recommended that each school should have its own school year, with an examination of the pupils in the last month, the manager and teacher should be notified at least a couple of weeks previous to the date of the examination, and I think increments must be annual and automatic if the dissatisfaction existing for some years is to be removed, as it is impossible to have a uniform system of inspection, and besides examination would benefit the children and please the parents. The inspectors are not properly trained for their work; they are fault-finding and know nothing of encouragement, guidance, or sympathy. Inspection suits lay inspectors and suits the teachers for the proper discharge of their arduous duties.

15688. You have mentioned automatic increments. Is there nothing to add to that?—It is the way in the Girl Service.

15689. Do you mean on any kind of particular report?—On a good kind of report, a satisfactory report.

15690. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—In the absence of a bad report?—Yes, that is the way I would put it.

15691. Mr. KERR.—Looking at the observation book, I notice that as early as 1908, and continuously almost from that date, the inspectors have pointed out the inadequacy of the school buildings?—Yes.

15692. And have expressed the opinion in one report that the Reverend manager ought to build a new school?—Yes, that is so.

15693. That tends to confirm your view that the National Board was endeavouring to bring pressure to bear on the managers through the medium of these reports?—That is so.

15694. Mr. HENRY.—Are you quite clear that Mr. Dewar stated that there was no effective teaching in Belfast?—Yes, I am; I am sure of that.

15695. Now, I would ask you to listen carefully to this paragraph from Mr. Dewar's report in the Appendix to the 37th Report of the Commissioner for the year 1910-11. Here is Mr. Dewar's opinion of the Belfast teachers: "The teachers have all passed the necessary examinations and possess the requisite scholarship to entitle them to rank as teachers in National schools. Many of them have been trained in recognised training colleges and have had the advantage of studying for two years under the guidance of skilful professors. They have also enjoyed the benefit of attending schools taught by select teachers, where they have seen improved methods of imparting knowledge, in dealing with children, and of fostering and developing the intelligence. In addition to these preparations for their special work a considerable number of them have elected to continue their studies and to join classes taken by expert teachers, with a view of gaining greater knowledge and of becoming more familiar with the art of teaching and training children. Schools for the practice of cookery work and kindergarten are being made very attractive. One cannot speak too highly of the women teachers. They are more punctual in attendance, and many of them are worthy of the highest distinction which the Commission can confer. I should like to see the highest grades of the teaching profession with their accompanying emoluments open to every assistant teacher who shows merit, and to see some special recognition given to every principal who is pre-eminent for ability and devotion to his work." Now, can you reconcile that statement in Mr. Dewar's report with the statement that you have given that he said there was no effective teaching in Belfast?—I cannot.

15696. Mr. HENRY.—Neither can I.

15697. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—In your reply the following passage occurs: "I think it is scarcely fair to the Resident Commissioner indirectly to charge him with the lowering of marks"—Yes.

15698. I wanted to know whether that referred to the following words that appear in the chief inspector's report: "Unquestionably the frequent visits of the Resident Commissioner to the schools in the various circuits have had a tendency to induce the inspectors to exercise greater discrimination in their awards." Was that the passage you referred to?—Yes, that was the passage.

15699. And you took that to indicate that the visits of the Resident Commissioner had had the effect of lowering the merit marks and raising the standard?—Yes, I think that was what was meant.

15700. Mr. HENRY.—Here is just one other extract with reference to the Belfast teachers. It is from Mr. Kelly: "The teachers are a deserving body of public servants. They discharge their duties with real and efficiency, and a special word of praise is due to the assistants in Belfast, who perform their arduous duties with unflagging energy. The principals too are teachers of high character, and with few exceptions they set an example of skill and devotion to duty. Now that there are fewer openings for principal teachers, owing to the reduction in the number of schools, I should like to see assistants of long and meritorious service promoted to second grade."

E

27th June, 1913.]

Mr. G. H. Tono, examined.

[Continued.]

I explained in my previous general report that the teachers have a great deal to contend with, especially in Belfast. They are often considerably out of pocket for the heating, cleaning, and upkeep of the school. A few years ago a teacher of a small school in that city spent about £15 in repairs. In many cases I have been informed on good authority that the teachers of a certain Belfast school have to pay the rent for the school. Now, that, as far as the qualifications of the teachers is concerned, corroborates Mr. Dewar's report. And then there is one other passage which corroborates your

evidence: "A case lately came under my notice where three was reason to believe that the teacher was the owner of the schoolhouse and the Commissioners withdrew the grant. As a boy, I often wondered what the bed of the ocean would reveal if the waters were dried up, and I am anxious to know all the anomalies that would be laid bare, especially in Belfast, if the teachers would only lift the veil." And you have lifted up a little corner of it apparently to-day?—Well, Mr. Kelly is an Inspector that I never had. He came once to examine a candidate assistant.

Mr. W. C. Born, Principal Teacher Ravenscroft National School, Belfast, examined.

15701. The CHAIRMAN.—How long have you been teacher of the Ravenscroft National school?—29 years.

15702. I think I leased you were at Bushmills?—No, at Clough, Co. Antrim; that was where I began. I was principal there. I have been principal for almost 33 years.

15703. For 19 years as head master of Ravenscroft National school?—Yes.

15704. What is the number of pupils?—It usually runs over 600.

15705. Has it risen much under your principalship?—Yes. I commenced with 32 pupils.

15706. How many assistants have you now?—We have 11. We had 12, but we have been reduced.

15707. Have you been reduced?—Yes, on the rule requiring 10 square feet per pupil.

15708. That is owing to the new requirements?—Yes.

15709. Are those requirements obligatory on all schools?—Yes, if there is not space. They insist upon reducing.

15710. Is that a new rule of the Board?—Yes.

15711. And in consequence of that new rule you have had to send away pupils?—Oh, yes, I have reduced admission to several hundreds.

15712. And there is a great number of children in your immediate neighbourhood?—Yes.

15713. And is there any provision being made for them?—None whatever.

15714. I understand that you have had even more to do with the collection of statistics than Mr. Todd, who has just given his evidence?—Not very much.

15715. I asked him about statistics and he referred me to you. One of your great complaints was that there was a great rise in the standard?—Yes.

15716. In the years beginning with 1908. Now, can you give us the exact facts as to the raising of the standard, and the way it affected the schools?—We were not notified that the standard was raised, but you will get it all in my remarks at the deputation.

15717. It is true to state that 47 per cent. of the schools were reduced in 1907?—I would say so. I know they were reduced very much.

15718. And then you say on page 178* of the memorandum of the Deputation to the Resident Commissioner that most of the schools were reduced?—Yes, as far as we know.

15719. What is the meaning of "most" as compared with 47 per cent.?—We got over 47 per cent. of the schools that we applied to, and we knew several others that were reduced. They did not let us know it themselves, but we got it indirectly.

15720. Now, that reduction set in, as you say, after 1905?—Yes, after the change of head inspectors.

15721. It was not due, apparently, entirely to a new inspector, because I think you or Mr. Todd say that Mr. Kelly, before 1905, was what was called a lenient inspector?—Yes, a fair inspector.

15722. And that after 1905 his reports became more severe?—He was changed to another district in Belfast.

15723. Is that true? Personally, I do not know. He was my inspector before 1905, and I was very well pleased with him; I heard that he had become more severe.

15724. That Mr. Kelly varied very much after 1905 as compared with before 1905?—I heard that, and, of course, his own reports in the Appendix show it.

15725. On what do you found the statement or suggestion that the Resident Commissioner took exception to, that this variation was inspired from some quarter?—On what do you found the suggestion that the rise in the standard was due to inspiration from some quarter?—It was the change of chief inspectors.

15726. You said you could not locate that quarter?—We suspected it was Mr. Hynes.

15727. You seemed to attribute it to the central office?—Oh, later on; I believe all of us have placed it on the central office.

15728. Do you now say that the instructions came from the central office?—That is the suspicion now.

15729. Do you know that it was denied by the Resident Commissioner at your deputation?—Yes.

15730. And you have also in your own statement suggested that Mr. Hynes was the origin of it?—We thought that at the time.

15731. You do not think so now?—We are not sure; I imagine he was not; I think it was from the office.

15732. What is your reason for thinking that in the face of the Resident Commissioner's solemn assertion?—The Resident Commissioner denies it, and so does Mr. Hynes. When we appealed to the Resident Commissioner and we thought a change would take place, but there was no change whatever, I think my own case got worse afterwards.

15733. It was with regard to those statistics that Mr. Todd referred me to you, the statistics of which Mr. McMillan did?—He was my inspector for a number of years.

15734. I suppose you have the number of his reductions?—Yes, I have not been looking over them lately.

15735. You say that Mr. McMillan gave only 8.4 "very good's" against 29 per cent. for the rest of Ireland?—Yes.

15736. You say that he gave only 36.7 "goods" against 45.0 for the rest of Ireland?—Yes.

15737. You remember that?—I do.

15738. Now, you adhere to those statistics?—I do, sir.

15739. And have you looked into the chief inspector's rejoinder to your complaint?—I have.

15740. Did you look into their statistics?—I did not look into their statistics. It is chiefly their reference to myself that I wish to deal with.

15741. But did you not look at the statistics?—I have not studied them, but as far as I can see they do not prove very much. We have other members from our Association who expect to appear before the Committee, and who have studied them more than I did.

15742. It really surprises me that you have not looked into the statistics?—I did not specialise in all these figures.

15743. The "excellents" and "very goods" varied from 182 in 1904 to 114 or 112 in 1909. Do you remember that?—I do not.

15744. And I suppose that this, if it is a fact, is the cause of the discontent in the Belfast district?—Yes.

15745. And how far back would you place the origin of that discontent?—1905 or 1906.

15746. Before that you were fairly contented?—We were working at the new method.

15747. We have heard here that the Belfast district was always a storm centre, even under the results system?—Referring to Mr. Kelly's report, you would think the finest fellows in Ireland were in Belfast.

* Vide Appendix VIII.

27th June, 1913.]

Mr. W. G. Bore, examined.

[Continued.]

16746. Do you agree with what was stated by someone the other day, that the Belfast district, as you might expect from the vigour of the northern race, was little inclined to acquiesce in any existing system?—I do not think that is so.

16747. You do not remember a disposition to rebel against the results system, do you?—I do not. I was only six years in Belfast under the results system.

16748. We have heard from Mr. Todd that the teachers of Belfast as a rule are responsible, or make themselves responsible, for the upkeep of their schools, that they collect or expend a considerable sum of money in the upkeep of their schools?—I think that is true. So far as I am concerned I got it from the parents of the children. When we want any alterations made in the schools we have sales of work, bazaar, concert, or something of that nature to raise the money.

16749. Your experience is like Mr. Todd's?—Not altogether. His school is in connection with a Church, while mine is not.

16750. It is more difficult for you?—I do not think it is; I think the school is more popular not being connected with any Church.

16751. Who is your manager?—A medical doctor, Doctor Fraser.

16752. By whom was he appointed?—He was appointed by the trustees, I believe.

16753. Who are the trustees?—The trustees are the gentlemen who own the school. I think the Rev. Mr. Valentine, the former manager, nominated Dr. Fraser.

16754. And does Dr. Fraser take any responsibility?—Oh, yes, he undertakes to raise funds. We have had little trouble in raising funds, as the parents willingly help us.

16755. So it is a combined business between you and the manager?—Yes.

16756. You, personally, have no grievance?—None so far as raising funds for the upkeep of the school is concerned.

16757. You work in concert with the manager?—Yes.

16758. And you have no personal burden thrown upon you?—I have none.

16759. Do you know any case, or have you reason to suspect any case, where the school is the property of the teacher?—Oh, that is talked about, of course, but there is no proof.

16760. You have heard it talked about?—Oh, yes.

16761. Do you believe it is so?—I do not think that any teacher in Belfast owns his school.

16762. The allegation is groundless, you think?—I may say I do not think he legally owns it. He cannot own it legally according to the Commissioners' Rules.

16763. The Baron of Ross.—Does he beneficially own it?—I do not think he does. Of course, it is a question I could not know.

16764. The CHAIRMAN.—You say the change of inspectors took place in 1906?—Yes.

16765. And those men who before had been giving lenient reports changed to severity?—Yes, Mr. Kelly was one.

16766. Mr. HAMILTON.—Are there two Mr. Kellys?—This is Mr. P. J. Kelly. He was changed from one district of Belfast to another, and has recently been changed back again.

16767. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, with regard to the character of the Belfast teachers, did you hear Mr. Dewar say there was no effective teaching in Belfast? He told me that himself.

16768. Where were you when he said that to you?—In my own school.

16769. And had he recently arrived?—Perhaps, a year or two before that.

16770. He said there was no effective teaching?—No effective teaching; and that Mr. McMillan was sent to the North to rouse the teachers up. Those remarks were made to me, and to Dr. Gibson and several others.

16771. How many inspectors have you been under since 1906?—Mr. McMillan, Mr. Kelly, and Mr. Dewar. Mr. McMillan came in 1907. I am under Mr. Kelly now. My school is now in Mr. Kelly's section.

16772. I do not know whether you want me to go into your special relations with Mr. McMillan?—I would be very pleased.

16773. I see you have down here the observations of Mr. McMillan on page 148.* You want to refute some of his statements?—Yes, I wish to refute them all.

16774. But you have made a rejoinder to his remarks?—I have.

16775. Where is that?—This is a copy of it.

16776. Is not that rejoinder sufficient when it is accepted?—Yes, I think it would be.

16777. That is the rejoinder which I have now here before me, "Mr. Boyd's reply, No. 4." Would you put that in evidence?—Yes.

16778. May I take it that you would like this to be taken in evidence, read and pointed?—I would be very pleased. I would like to add something where he refers to my daughter.

16779. You say that this rejoinder of yours would satisfy you if it was accepted by us as evidence on the point, and printed in our proceedings?—Yes, it would.

16780. Is there any addition, briefly, that you would like to make?—Yes. He said I had been praising my little girl's mathematical attainments and he asked her to prove Euclid I. 17 without producing a side.

16781. He said he intended that as a compliment?—It is a compliment he paid to the teachers of other schools as well as to me. One of my boys who was a student happened to hear that he gave the same exercise in a neighbouring school the previous day or so, and he took his little sister and showed her how to do it, and that is how she happened to be able to do it.

16782. Is there anything else on which you wish to enlarge or make a comment?—I think that is all.

16783. We will print this as read, and that will satisfy you?—Yes.

16784. Is there any other remark that you wish to make about Mr. McMillan?—No, I think I have everything of importance in that.

16785. Now, do you wish to say anything about Mr. Dewar's remarks about Ravenscroft?—No, except where he contradicts my statement, as you will see in the teachers' rejoinder.

16786. Yes.—There are some other figures which I should like to give now that are not given in the rejoinders.

16787. Where do those come in?—Below my reply. "The following is my experience of the truth of the above statement for the past few years." Mr. Dewar says the teacher gets the report within one month of the date of inspection. Well, you will find my experience on that subject up to 1911.

16788. Mr. Dewar says the 111 schools received the inspector's report from the Education Office within one month from the date of inspection, and you wish to controvert that?—I do, sir.

16789. And you give then a number of particulars?—Yes, and in addition I have some others here. I put them in the synopsis I have already given you.

16790. In addition to the examples you have already given in your rejoinder you wish to give these?—I do, I say:—

Ravenscroft N.E. (Roll No. 14812), Belfast, 4/12/11.—Since the deputation waited on Dr. Starke on 6th February, 1911, the above school, of which Mr. Boyd, one of the deputations, is principal, has received very particular attention from the inspectors. During the 17 years ending 31/3/10, in which the school was in operation, there were 29 inspectors' visits, or an average of 1.7 per year. In the period between 28/3/11 and 14/11/11, there were seven inspectors' visits, or an average of 2½ per year. Two of these visits with a period of nine months between were named "Annual Inspections," and each lasted for two days. During the past eleven years—since the new method of marking reports was introduced—the school got "good" three times, "very good" five times, and "excellent" three times. According to the Board's circular of 30/3/11, in a school with a record like above "It is unnecessary that detailed inspections be made each year. Visits for a general report may, as a rule, be short. . . . A more searching inspection of the work of a school of this

27th June, 1913.]

Mr. W. C. Boyd, examined.

[Continued.]

class should, however, take place occasionally, say once in every three or four years, &c." It cannot but be evident to anyone why the inspectors at present in Belfast should deem it necessary (instead of following the instructions in the circular referred to) to hold two "annual" inspections, lasting two days each, within nine months in this school, and also to make five incidental visits during the same time. The circular also states "Expressions of satisfaction shall appear there (in Observation Book) as well as notices concerning defects in the work." Since Mr. MacMillan got charge of inspecting this school in August, 1907, eighteen pages of the Observation Book have been written. Except in a few minor details re order and discipline no "Expressions of satisfaction" appear, all those pages being a succession of fault-finding. In his notes in Observation Book made last month about 13 defects were noted, but nothing was found in this large school worthy of praise. In the principal's opinion most of these defects existed only in the inspector's imagination.

The three following examples of Mr. MacMillan's treatment of this school have been brought under the notice of the Education Office, and in each case the Office decided that Mr. MacMillan was wrong:—

On August 11th, 1910, he noted—"The maximum number on the Rolls must be limited to 643." (Two years earlier he gave instructions to limit the number on Rolls to 643.) As this would have meant a reduction in the teaching staff, the manager made an appeal to the Board on 30th August. On 10th and 11th November a letter (L. 341-10, C. 8) was received stating that as vacancies occurred in the teaching staff such vacancies were not to be filled and the attendance was to be gradually reduced to the limits prescribed by Rule 185.

On 13th June last the inspector called again and expressed himself in a manner not too courteous because the principal had not followed his instructions of August 11th. Mr. Boyd told Mr. MacMillan that he did not believe the Board intended to victimise teachers, and this would certainly be the case if he literally followed Rule 185. The inspector replied that reducing the attendance would not mean the dismissal of the teachers. Mr. Boyd said that he knew of the average were reduced teachers would be obliged to leave. Mr. MacMillan replied in a very offensive way "You know! much you know!" The principal also said that he would ask the manager to write to the Board for instructions. Mr. MacMillan replied in his most gross way, "You can do what you like, but I know what I'll do."

Mr. Boyd wrote the following letter to the manager, and he forwarded it to the Education Office:—

"RAVENSCROFT N. SCHOOL,
BELFAST, JUNE 13, 1911.

"DEAR DOCTOR,

"The Inspector, Mr. MacMillan, examined our Mathematics to-day. He was very indignant with me for taking, as he says, a wrong meaning out of the letter you got from the Education Office, dated 9th Nov. (L. 341/100/8). This letter states "Should the provision of adequate accommodation as laid down in Rule 185 not be feasible on the occurrence of vacancies in the present staff (115) of assistants, such vacancies, to the number of three, are not to be filled, and the attendance is to be gradually reduced by the non-enrolment of new pupils, to the limits prescribed in that Rule." I took this to mean that in reply to your appeals about safeguarding the present staff the number then allowed on Rolls (948) was not to be interfered with, but as vacancies occurred on the staff we were then to enrol no new pupils until the staff would be reduced by three.

"The Inspector's interpretation of the letter is that no new pupil should have been enrolled since the date of your letter, 9th November last, and that a lowering of the attendance consequent on this would not endanger the teachers' positions. He has threatened to get all new admissions cancelled from our attendance since 9th November.

"Will you kindly ask the Office or the Board which is the correct interpretation of this letter? If the inspector be correct why were you notified that owing to a fall of two pupils for last quarter salary is to be

withdrawn from our last assistant for next quarter unless the attendance should be up to the standard—545. But should he be correct in his statement, or rather threat, that we must cancel the attendance of all new pupils since November 9th, then still I can say it is that we have some useless employment for our holidays. There were 90 new pupils admitted since 9th November, as well as many re-admissions, so you can understand the task which Mr. MacMillan proposes for us so soon after the Census Pupils.

"I think it is a great pity that troubles, not in connection with our proper duties as educators, seem recently to have become interminable, and the more thoroughly we try to do our work, we seem to get the less credit for it.

"Sincerely yours,

W. C. BOYD,

"Dr. Fraser,

"Gorkyle, Stranstown, Belfast."

On 28th June last the manager received a letter from the Office similar to that of 9th November. Undeterred by his want of success on the two previous occasions to get teachers dismissed, he again called on 13th September and noted "Rule 185 is now in force, and therefore further enrolments cannot be made until average has fallen to the number allowed by the rule unless special exemption is granted by the Commissioners." As this would have meant the dismissal of three assistants, the manager again appealed to the Board, and as was only to be expected, a satisfactory reply was received, again safeguarding the teachers. It is worthy of note that at this inspector's previous visit on 14th August he informed the principal that he was going on his holidays during September. However, his anxiety to detect probable dishonesty in this particular school was so great that his keen sense of duty compelled him to visit it at 9.5 a.m. one day in the middle of his holidays. The methods of this inspector had been seriously impugned by the members of the deputation. It is evident that he treats Dr. Starkie's wishes, as expressed to the deputation, as well as the Board's circular of June, 1911, with the utmost contempt. Had Mr. MacMillan been taught an inspector's duties, the manager, who is a truly professional man, the principal, who has sufficient common sense to attend to a supervising this large school, and the officials in the Education Office, would have been saved the trouble and annoyance of writing so many letters in defence of the rights of the teachers.

15798. Is there any other point?—That is all with regard to Mr. Deane.

15799. Now have you anything to say with regard to Messrs. Fraser and Hyatt?—Yes. There is something on page 108* of the report.

15796. That is the observations of the Chief Inspectors?—Yes, in the second column, third paragraph.

15800. They say that you alleged, "I think I may say that the inspectors were the cause of the failure of the results system"?—Yes.

15797. They deny that?—They deny that.

15798. What led you to say that?—In my remarks at that deputation I have shown the absurdity of many of their questions. I remember losing a considerable sum of money because the children on one occasion were not able to tell the width of potato drills to an inch. The width given in 26 inches and some of them had 25.

15799. Have you anything to say about the number of teachers who were afraid to sign your memorial, as you say "Others, for reasons which may be surmised, were unwilling to let us know"?—They were afraid of the inspectors taking revenge.

15800. And they challenged the word "surmised"?—Yes, and then they themselves "surmised" in the next sentence.

15801. But still you admit that that is not very strong evidence, though there may be actual suspicion?—I know several teachers myself who refused to give us their names because they were afraid of it looking out in the neighbourhood.

15802. Then the point as to "surmise" was unfortunate, was it?—Possibly.

15803. I notice Dr. Starkie fastened on that, and said that you were giving suspicious instead of facts?—

* Vide Appendix VIII.

I did not want to give the names of the teachers who had mentioned their cases to me, as they were given in correspondence.

15864. What is your next point?—The chief inspectors' remarks about Mr. McMillan questioning my method of marking the roll.

15865. These are not new things?—These are new things that I am speaking of, because I had not seen the Chief Inspectors' remarks about myself till I got this (the Report).

15866. You speak of the inspectors having no practical experience. Is that a new thing?—Yes. I have not referred to any of the chief inspectors in the recorder.

15867. So it is rather new?—It is new.

15868. I want to ask you to what extent do you wish inspectors to be appointed from the ranks of National Teachers?—I wish them to be appointed altogether from the National Teachers.

15869. You wish the inspectors to be a grade of the service?—Yes, and I think it would attract better men to the service.

15870. And you would have nobody appointed from outside the ranks of the national teachers?—Suppose a successful national teacher became an Intermediate teacher, he should not be debarred from becoming an inspector.

15871. But he must have been a national teacher?—Yes.

15872. Would it not satisfy you if a university graduate having been appointed on probation, took six months to a primary school?—Six months would be of very little use to show the working of a school.

15873. You would not be satisfied with that?—No, I would not.

15874. "We understand the junior inspector's increment depends on the report of his senior." This statement is quite unfounded?—That is, I suppose, the only correct statement the chief inspectors made when criticising my remarks.

15875. That was certainly unfounded?—Yes, probably I made a mistake in that. We thought it was a fact; but that is the only paragraph that I give in to.

15876. What else?—I think that is all.

15877. That is in reference to the reply of the Chief Inspectors?—Yes.

15878. Mr. KERRIN.—You appear in both your personal capacity and also in a representative capacity. Can you tell me the membership of the body of teachers for which you speak?—About 800; it is the Belfast Teachers' Association I am speaking of.

15879. Have you and Mr. Todd been deputed to give evidence on their behalf?—Yes.

15880. Have you arrived at a general agreement among yourselves as to the experience of the teachers with regard to the present system of inspection?—We have, yes.

15881. So that the general trend of your evidence may be taken as representing the experience of the great body of Belfast teachers?—Yes, I would say so.

15882. Well, now, you complain that uniformity of inspection has not been obtained under the present system?—Yes.

15883. And as an illustration of the lack of uniformity I understand you wish to draw special attention to the variation of the merit marks in your own school?—Yes.

15884. You include that in your proofs?—I do.

15885. Roughly it was this?—In 1907, date of report, October, you got "very good"; 1908, date of report, May, "good"; 1909, date of report, August, "very good"; 1910, date of report, April, "good"; 1911, date of report, March, "very good"; 1912, November, "good"; 1912, December, "very good"; 1913, the report not yet received?—Yes, and for 1913 our report has not yet been received, though our inspection was held over four months ago, and though according to some evidence given here, we should have got it inside two or three weeks after our inspection.

15886. The CHAIRMAN.—It is four months since you were inspected?—Yes.

15887. This school was inspected in February of this year?—24th, 25th, and 26th.

15888. And you have not got the extracts from the Board?—No, I have not got them yet.

15889. Mr. KERRIN.—You are acquainted with the present instruction to inspectors that they are to consider the permanent aspects of a school rather than chance fluctuations in particular subjects?—I have heard that.

15890. Now, looking at the marks of your own school you are able to surmise that those instructions are not carried out?—I do not think they are, because a school with the same staff is not likely to deserve "v.g." and "g." alternately for several years in succession.

15891. That is your experience so far as the attaining of uniformity is concerned?—Yes. I believe we have no uniformity.

15892. And in the first four years you had the same inspectors?—Yes, it depended on the time of the year what mark he gave us. When our inspection was early we got "good," when late "very good," and I believe if he came early enough we might have got "bad." I do not believe any man can estimate the amount of work done in the first two or three months in each subject.

15893. The BURNER or ROSE.—I understood that the school year begins in July?—Yes.

15894. And should not be examined much earlier than May?—Yes.

15895. And you got "very good" in October?—The October report was for the August examination.

15896. But that was held still earlier in the year, for the school year begins on the 1st of July, and if the examination was held in August, it was in the second month of the year?—It was on the previous year's work they were examined, because the classes were promoted on the 1st of July, and when they were examined or inspected in August it was on the previous year's work.

15897. So, from that point of view, he would be examining the children in the second month after July?—Oh, no, it is different; he examined them on the previous year's work. Supposing he took them at the end of three months on new subjects, he could not possibly find out what they had learned.

15898. It is not easy to see what is meant by "early in the year" or "late in the year"?—I mean early in the year in new subjects, e.g., the children that were inspected in August in fourth standard were examined in the third standard programme.

15899. And when would they commence to be examined on the fourth standard programme?—It would depend on the date of the inspection. The inspection date fluctuates.

15900. But is not the school year first to begin on the 1st of July?—Yes, but I think a school should have a whole year to prepare for examination, and then it should be held at the end of the year.

15901. Mr. KERRIN.—I think the point his lordship is making is sound. Your theory is that if the inspector examines early in the year he will give a bad mark and later a good mark?—Yes.

15902. But your dates do not support that theory?—I think they do.

15903. Mr. KERRIN.—When the school year began in July and the pupils were examined in August they were examined at the end of the previous year, on the previous year's work?—Yes.

15904. And, therefore, examined on the programme which they had completed?—Yes.

15905. The school year for which was finished?—Yes, that is my point. If they are examined in November, it will be on the new year's work, of course.

15906. Mr. KERRIN.—When they were examined in February you got "very good"?—Yes, that was Mr. DORRIS, but had it been Mr. McMillan he would very probably have given us a lower mark.

15907. Here is a school under the same principal, and yet its report varies in a very remarkable fashion over six years, and in view of this your point is that uniformity has not been attained?—Has not been attained.

15908. The BURNER or ROSE.—The reason given that the variation depends on the period of the year is not satisfied. There is an examination held in February, and the report is "very good," and there is an examination held in March, a month later, and the report is "good"?—Two different inspectors, Mr. DORRIS examined in February, and Mr. McMillan in March.

18619. The CHAIRMAN.—May I ask you this? Dr. Starkie and other officials have told us that a good inspector going in within a month or two of the beginning of the school year will be able to take proper account of that, and consider that the children will only be up to a certain standard, and recognise that in his report?—I don't agree with Dr. Starkie.

18620. You do not think it is possible?—I do not think it is possible.

18621. Mr. KERRIS.—What is your view with regard to the uniform school year—do you think each school ought to have its own school year?—I think each school ought to have its own school year, and have inspection or examination, I should say, in the last month.

18622. Is that merely your own view?—I believe it is the view of nearly all our association.

18623. Now, with regard to later, you mention that you also have personal experience?—A little.

18624. Would you be good enough to tell me what it was?—In November, 1911, Mr. McMillan told me that he was afraid he would have to lower our report because the writing of the senior infants was barely satisfactory, and because there was a deficiency in the tone of the third and fourth standards. I told him that our school was well disciplined, and he said there was nothing wrong with our discipline, but that the tone of these boys was deficient.

18625. The CHAIRMAN.—Did you understand that?—I did not.

18626. Did you guess what he meant?—I had not the least idea.

18627. Mr. KERRIS.—Did he explain what he meant?—He did not. My opinion was that it was our year for getting "good," and he was determined to give it.

18628. I am glad to see from your Observation Book that on the 20th of February, 1912, Mr. Kelly says—"I am well pleased with the superior tone of this school, and with the general character of the work done. The teachers and pupils appear to me to be quite happy and earnest and assiduous, and for this the principal deserves a large part of the credit. Kindness and firmness have combined to produce a particularly pleasant atmosphere," although, in November, 1911, you had obtained such a poor mastery of tone that it was conveyed to you that you might lose your increment?—No; it is harder to win working for, not increment. I am in the happy position of having a salary above the maximum.

18629. What is "above the maximum"?—The amount of my salary is fixed at £384. They fixed my salary on the average which I earned during the three years ending 31st March, 1900. But as my school and salary had grown rapidly during those years the average was very unfair to me. We appealed frequently for justice, but were finally informed to the effect that I must be content to take the chance of war, and I happened to be one of the sufferers.

18630. In that statement, which we have taken as evidence, in making your extracts from the Observation Book you are a little unfair to Mr. McMillan on one point and you are a little lenient to him on another. You made this extract from the Observation Book. I know inspectors are not infallible, and I have compared the Observation Book with the extract from it, and as you have it here he says—"Special pains should be taken to see that they hold the pen properly, and not to write with the edge of it."—Well, he was finding fault with some of the teachers for neglecting to mark exercises.

18631. In the first paragraph he says—"The school work went on satisfactorily during my visit, and very good order was kept," instead of "order." However, your point comes to this, that is not a matter of individual action but a question of system and atmosphere?—Yes.

18632. I gather your experience to be that the tone of the present system is wrong?—Yes.

18633. And you have the feeling, and the feeling is general among the teachers, that while there may have been no definite instructions from the office as to the line of policy to be pursued by the inspectors, yet there were certain intimations given to them?—Yes; that is our belief.

18634. And that feeling is very generally held?—It is very general in Belfast.

18635. I understood you also to complain that after this deputation you were subjected to something of what we would call espionage?—Yes. During the previous 17 years that I had been teaching in Ballynash before appearing on this deputation I had 1.7 visits per year on an average from inspectors. During the next nine months I had 7 visits; they were watching me well.

18636. That at any rate did happen?—They could not find anything wrong, but I was well watched.

18637. Now, I observe that it is complained that in cases where the Belfast teachers consider themselves to have a grievance they did not apply directly and immediately to the Commissioners?—Yes.

18638. Can you furnish any explanation of that?—I never heard of a teacher gaining anything by appealing. I appealed myself in a case once about mathematics and Mr. McMillan was sent. I appealed against his decision as unsatisfactory, and he was sent to investigate the charge himself, and of course he found himself not guilty.

18639. Have you anything to say with regard to the failure to appeal?—I think the teachers feel that appeal is useless. Mr. McNeill, chief inspector, told you that he does not acknowledge that there are any unreasonable inspectors. What good in appealing to a gentleman holding this view?

18640. At any rate you have not got confidence that your appeal would be fairly heard?—Yes.

18641. And am I right in thinking that the relations between teachers and inspectors in Belfast during six years at any rate appear to be deplorably bad?—Very bad.

18642. Now, apart from criticism of individual inspectors resulting from your dissatisfaction with the system, do you think it is the system of inspection and not the personality of the inspectors that is responsible?—Yes, certainly I think the system is responsible.

18643. Have you considered any proposals for re-constructing the system, and in what respect would you amend it, and how?—One way would be to go back to examination.

18644. By examination what do you mean?—I mean examination at the end of 12 months, and let each school have its own school year.

18645. Individual examination?—Individual examination of each pupil having a certain attendance, and the teacher to get two or three weeks notice of the date of examination.

18646. But you would not base the teacher's salary on the result of the examination?—I think a teacher who did not do his work well and who did not get a successful pass should be kept out of his increment.

18647. But in general you want the movement to be annual and automatic?—Yes.

18648. You do not want the automatic increment to be a premium on incompetence?—No, I think an incompetent teacher ought to be passed out of the service.

18649. But you would not retain those merit marks that we have at present?—Oh, not at all; I would have none of them.

18650. On what sort of report would you base the granting of increments?—In the absence of unsatisfactory reports I think the teacher's increment ought to be annual and automatic.

18651. I wish you would think this over a little before you answer, and tell me deliberately whether you do want back that system of individual examination of every pupil in every subject, with a record kept of his answering?—No, I hardly think it will be necessary. I think they ought to have a certain number of attendances in the first place to qualify them.

18652. Would you be contented with class examination instead of individual examination?—Yes, I would. Class examination would do very well. Select a class and examine it, but an inspector should not be allowed to select individual pupils in a class.

18653. You do not want to have it in complete detail, but you still think the element of examination might be extended?—Yes, I think so; because an inspector cannot be a judge of the merits of the school from inspecting. I will give you a good example.

of that in the case of mathematics. No teacher is paid anything for teaching mathematics unless the children are examined. The Board does not pay on the mere inspecting but on the examination.

15884. Now, there is another point upon which you ventured an opinion which I want you to consider. I understood you to say that you thought inspectors ought to be appointed exclusively from the ranks of the National teachers?—I would say so. That is my own opinion.

15885. One of the inspectors in Belfast who appears to have given the least satisfaction was a gentleman who had exactly those qualifications?—Some of the best inspectors we ever had in Belfast had been National teachers.

15886. That particular inspector with whom Mr. Todd had relations of a lively character had been a National teacher for eight years?—Several inspectors have been National teachers. I looked upon most of them as gentlemanly men though their inspection was usually difficult, and they gave us credit for our work.

15887. Do you not think that you would get a better staff of inspectors on the whole if you had a mingling of the various elements, if the men who had been teachers and had been promoted from the ranks counted for one part and men of university training counted for another part?—I would be inclined to keep it to the teachers. I have some experience of university graduates, and I think they would expect too much from the children.

15888. If there was some arrangement that they were obliged to spend a certain period in teaching, would that satisfy you?—If they fought successfully for six years instead of six months, and then they should be selected by competitive examination.

15889. The *Science or Book*.—Is the business of the inspector merely to test the knowledge the children have got, or is it really there to guide and direct the aims and methods of the teacher?—He should do both.

15890. It seemed to me that you were laying emphasis on the fact of his being able to test the children?—Yes, but he cannot do so without having practical experience of children. I fear if I had been made an inspector myself when I was quite young, without knowing so much of the children as now, I would have been very hard on them.

15891. Mr. KERR.—In the remarks of the chief inspectors they say that Belfast has been always a storm centre?—Yes.

15892. Is there a repudiation of authority on the part of the Belfast teachers?—I do not think so.

15893. And you were rebuffed for quoting Mr. Birtwell's statement that a teacher should be captain on his own quarter-deck?—I think so, as long as he does his duty.

15894. And you are perfectly willing to accept the definition of liberty as "Wise obedience to just laws"?—Yes, quite agreeable.

15895. Mr. BIRTWELL.—You have given us pretty strong evidence in favour of examination of the children. Apart from your own interest, why do you wish for examination?—I would say for the good of the community. The people, I think, are not so well satisfied with the present system as the old system.

15896. Do you think the parents took a greater interest in the school then than at present?—Yes, and in some cases the teachers are not allowed to give home lessons. I always insist on giving home lessons.

15897. Of course, you are aware that when the new system came in in 1900 home lessons were discouraged?—Yes.

15898. And in a subsequent circular the Commissioners say a misconception had arisen, and they did not object to home lessons?—Yes.

15899. Do the pupils themselves take more interest in their work than they did?—They do not, though I think they are better readers, but I think they are deficient in other useful subjects, for instance, in mathematics.

15900. How much of that improvement in reading is due to the fact that the teachers were allowed to introduce a variety of reading books into the schools instead of being obliged to use one set that was too difficult for the children?—Well, the variety of books might, perhaps, have something to do with it.

15901. What time should the examination be held?—At the end of the year, each school to have its own year.

15902. That is the first month of the new year?—I should think so, and the teacher to get due notice of the date of the examination.

15903. Would there not be a danger under those circumstances of a portion of year being devoted to what may be called cram?—The inspector would see to that. He would have to call two or three times during the year, and he could see what was going on. The use of inspection should be to prevent cram.

15904. Has that objection to the preparation for the visit of the inspector been removed by the arrangements of the present system?—I do not think so.

15905. When did you get notice?—Last year I got notice of my inspection at the end of July or the beginning of August, with instructions to fill up the forms immediately.

15906. So you got notice either in July or August?—Yes, and the inspection took place towards the end of February.

15907. So that you had all that time for special rubbing up, so that if that applied to the old system it applies with increased force to the present?—I should think so.

15908. When the inspectors come do the teachers find their suggestions useful?—Yes, in some cases, and in some cases very foolish.

15909. Would you give me an example of one of those useful suggestions?—I cannot remember any now. There are several in the book here, but I cannot remember them; I can remember the foolish ones more easily.

15910. Would you explain about the teaching of reading?—Is it about the inspector getting three or four classes into one room?

15911. Yes?—He asked me to sit beside him on the platform when three or four classes were in the room. Then he directed all the pupils to open their various reading books at a certain page, and all had to read simultaneously—different books, different rates, different pitch. It was like pandemonium while it lasted.

15912. Do you really suggest that my inspector would ask you to put two or three classes reading from different books, all reading aloud to you at the same time, each pupil reading as hard as he could?—I do.

15913. You did not think that was valuable?—I did not; it was annoying for a while, but it got very annoying.

15914. The CHAIRMAN.—Was that in the right?—It was in the nineties, 1895 or 1897 or 1899.

15915. Mr. BIRTWELL.—You tell us in another place that you were asked to teach the five cases of nouns?—Yes.

15916. Is that long ago?—That was 1900.

15917. That was not one of your present inspectors?—The inspector has retired, I believe, and I had no quarrel with him. The same inspector told our teachers to throw away the ball frames and sticks as aids to calculation, and to compel the children to calculate by their fingers.

15918. Is there anything wrong in doing it with the fingers?—I should prefer that they do it without them. I have seen children in 6th and 7th standards counting on their fingers.

15919. But he did not approve of all recognised apparatus?—He did not like it.

15920. How far do you think ought the inspector to interfere with the teacher's methods?—When he sees the teacher making what he considers an absolute mistake I think he ought to speak to him quietly about the thing, but not brow-beat him.

15921. But where he is working satisfactorily?—He should not interfere.

15922. He should allow him freedom?—I should say so.

15923. Has that freedom that has been promised by Dr. Sturges again and again been interfered with so far as your own individual knowledge goes?—Yes.

15924. In what way?—Inspectors wanting to put their hobbies on us. I have not thought that out very much or I could give you several examples.

15925. But you know as a matter of fact?—Yes.

15926. Even whose business has been going on

smoothly and the pupils making satisfactory progress?—Yes. One of my assistants who had been a monitor was an excellent writer, and I was very proud of the writing of her class, and I called Mr. McMillan's attention to it at one of his earlier visits. After looking over it he came and told me that those children knew nothing about writing. That is one example.

12953. Did he make any suggestions as to a change in the mode in teaching or not?—Yes, he said our first-class children ought to be able to write at least a page in half an hour.

12957. But that has nothing to do with the method of teaching writing?—Oh, no, he gave no instructions. He said they ought to be able to write for more.

12958. Now, with reference to the great fall in the marking, are you aware that an inspector was removed from the vicinity of Belfast?—I heard an inspector was removed, and if you refer to the one that I heard of, he examined our school once.

12959. But there was an inspector moved from the vicinity of Belfast in which it was said that he had been marking too soft?—That is one of the finest inspectors I ever had in the school. He had been a teacher and could go into a school and show the teacher how to teach a subject if he was not pleased with the way that things were going on.

12960. When he was removed did not the stiffening up of the marking in Belfast follow immediately on that?—Yes, I believe it did immediately; it coincided with that; but we only had him a short time in Belfast.

12961. And then would you not be justified in connecting the two things—does it not seem that there was some connection between his removal and the stiffening of the marking?—But Mr. Kelly was not removed.

12962. But if it came immediately on his removal, and that he was removed (as we have evidence) on the recommendation of the chief inspector, would not that show that the chief inspector thought that that inspector had been marking too low?—He had to raise it then.

12963. Then judging from your own experience, as far as you can gather from the teachers, was there any fall from efficiency among the teachers of the Belfast school which corresponded with that fall in the marking?—There was no fall in efficiency, as the teachers were largely the same, and they had not changed their nature. If a man be a good teacher up to, say, the age of 30, it is likely he will remain an efficient teacher to the end.

12964. Do you consider that the teachers had a grievance in having their marks lowered?—They had a serious grievance.

12964. I suppose you will admit that a teacher who could not possibly lose an increment will, if his mark is unjustly lowered, have a grievance from the professional point of view?—My own case is an example.

12965. Under the rules of the Board were you not entitled to have the case of the whole 111 schools investigated separately?—I do not think that could be done.

12966. Does not the rule of the Board provide for it?—Yes, but I can see no use in appealing. It was often more than two months from the date of the inspection before we knew what was the mark.

12967. But we have it in evidence that a school ought to be marked greedily by its tone, and that the tone of the school depends on the character of the teacher, and as the character of the teacher is more or less a permanent quantity, therefore the tone of the school ought to be permanent, and a mere fall in book knowledge ought not to interfere with the mark of the school, and if that be so the lapse of one or two months should not have interfered, and I suppose I am right in saying this, that the tone of your school at the present time is the same as what it was this day twelve months?—The same as it was 37 or 18 years ago.

12968. Then under the rule were they not entitled to have the case of each one of those schools investigated?—Yes.

12969. How many were investigated?—I do not know the number of cases.

12969. Of course you have seen the inspector's report?—Yes.

12941. There were, I think, about 13 of them?—Yes.

12942. And in those cases where the mark of the chief inspector was higher than the mark of the local inspector, did the teachers of those schools get the benefit of that, or did they get redress?—They got no redress. I know some cases. I don't know all the teachers, but I have been talking to some of them, and they got no redress.

12943. And the marks remained?—They remained as they were.

12944. And therefore they got no redress?—No redress.

Mr. HARRISON.—Only two cases.

Mr. HENLEY.—I think there are some, but if there are it does not touch my point.

Mr. HARRISON.—It might, because no increment might depend upon it.

12945. Mr. HENLEY.—I am sorry to hear that, because to any mind the loss of increment is less than the loss of professional reputation. The loss of professional reputation is far more than the loss of increment?—That is my impression too.

12946. The CHAIRMAN.—How long would it have taken to go over the whole 111 cases?—Half a year or so.

12947. Would they do it in half a year?—My own school would have taken three or four days to do. It is exceptionally large.

12948. But in any case, those teachers whose schools were marked higher by the chief inspectors than by the local inspectors got, as far as you know, no redress?—No redress.

12949. And the local inspector's mark, not being the proper mark of the school, still remains?—Yes, still remains.

12950. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—I wanted to make sure that you had brought forward all the points that you wished to bring before us. Have you done so?—I think I have.

12951. You think there is no other point?—Well, about special promotions, I would like to say that I think the conditions of service should be known. I only heard a few months ago that there was such a thing as a personal mark. In my school one assistant got special promotion, and another thinks he is equally entitled to it, but he has not got it, and he is very much annoyed about it. We know no reason why he was not promoted, and we have a letter from the Board here, but it does not give any reason. It says he is a good teacher.

12952. Mr. KAVANAGH.—I suppose the number was limited?—I am not sure.

12953. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—There is no limit to second grade at present, inasmuch as we are told that the numbers fixed for second grade have not been filled up, and also there is no limit yet for female teachers in the first grade, because the number fixed for female teachers in the first grade has not been filled up?—There is another point about triennial increments.

12954. What about that?—When they are due they ought to be paid without any further trouble. For example, I have an assistant whose triennial increment was due last August, and she got paid about the end of April, after the manager had written several letters. The Education Office always replied to the effect that the case was being considered.

12955. And you do not know how it came about that there was any doubt about it?—No reason given. There was no doubt, I believe.

12956. Mr. KERRAN.—The increment was paid from the date on which it accrued?—Oh, yes, but the teacher was kept out of it from August last till the end of April.

12957. The BARRON or ROSS.—But the National Board have to get the money from the Treasury, and the money does not come in automatically?—For the future it may be all right.

12958. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—I suppose you are quite satisfied yourself with regard to the suspicion entertained by some of the teachers and some other people, managers as well, that the Board receives a sum of money which it can deal with as it likes, and that some of it is returned to the Treasury?—I understand that quite well, but a great many teachers do not, I believe.

27th June, 1918.]

Mr. W. C. HORN, examined.

[Continued.]

15959. It would be desirable that the teachers should understand it perfectly, because it is likely to lead to misapprehension. I will read to you the report of the Select Committee on the Estimates. (Reads report.) You quite understand, therefore, that in preparing the estimates misapprehensions may occur, and that they cannot always tell how many pupils, for instance, there will be in attendance for which a stipend grant may be made. And in addition to that Parliament has control over all the expenditures by means of the Comptroller and Auditor-General, who won't allow any payment to be made for which there is not a regulation, so that the use of the word "surrender," which seems to be a technical one, simply means that sums of money, although voted, have not been expended during the year?—I have understood that for some time, but I know a good many people do not.

15960. It is highly desirable that that misapprehension with regard to what the Board can do and cannot do should be removed, and now that the teachers have a good cause of complaint they should not be citing causes of complaint for which there is no ground of all?—Yes.

15961. The Bazaar or Bore.—They are of opinion that the money would go to the Bore in a lump, but that is equally impossible, because there would be no Parliamentary control, so it must be voted under separate heads? Witness.—There are two other points. One is that it was said in 1911 that the method of marking the roll that I had submitted was a novel one. Here are two letters authorising me to mark the roll that way, ten years earlier, so it was not very novel. I submitted that to the Board through my manager, and that was the way I had for all those years, and that saved a good deal of paper.

15962. Mr. HARRISON.—You have stated it fully?—Another point is that I was reprimanded once; I forget how many years ago it was. We had an Educational Reform Association for the purpose of trying to improve the Belfast schools, and I happened to be a member of the Executive Committee. I got a reprimand because my name happened to be on the committee. Mr. Hynes was sent to question me about the matter, and my reprimand was on the basis that it was a controversial one. Our principal object was to improve the schools in Belfast.

15963. The CHAIRMAN.—And I think all over the country?—Well, principally in Belfast in the first place. The Association published a pamphlet and the names of the Committee appeared on it. Some friend marked my name and sent a copy to the Education Office, and Mr. Hynes was sent all the way to ask me if that was my name.

15964. Mr. HENLY.—Who investigated that?—Mr. Hynes. I did not know the gentleman when he called. He began to praise the good order and discipline of the school. Visitors often call to see the school, and so I thought he was only an ordinary visitor. I offered to show him round. He then told me that he was Mr. Hynes from the Education Office, and after a short conversation he showed me the pamphlet, and pointing to my name asked me if it were mine.

15965. Mr. KAVANAGH.—There is a rule against your joining religious associations and against joining political associations, but is there any rule against that?—Oh, in those days we dare not engage in controversy, but that is taken off now.

15966. But it was under the rules at the time?—Yes; but it is difficult to know what is controversy. I thought as long as I was trying to improve education in any way I was only doing my duty.

THIRTY-FIFTH DAY.—TUESDAY, JULY 15TH, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

PRESENT:—Sir SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman); The Most Rev. DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross; Sir HERMAN SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN COFFEY; Mr. HENRAGH E. B. HARRISON, D.A.; Mr. JEREMIAN HENLY; Mr. WALTER MCMURDOUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.; and Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL KEITLER, B.L.; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Mr. J. L. ROBERTSON, LL.D., H. M. Senior Chief Inspector, Scotland, examined.

15967. The CHAIRMAN.—You come from the Scottish Department. I only want to ask you a question about your experience to go on the "Niche." How long have you been in the service of the Scotch Department?—Since February, 1900.

15968. In what capacity did you enter?—I joined the staff as one of Her Majesty's inspectors of schools. I was appointed then full inspector.

15969. You are a graduate of a Scottish University?—M.A., LL.B., and LL.D. of Edinburgh University. My University conferred on me the honorary degree of LL.D. last year.

15970. How long have you been senior inspector in Scotland?—I have been just for the last two years senior chief inspector—since my predecessor retired in 1911.

15971. There is more than one senior inspector?—No; there are five chief inspectors in Scotland.

15972. That is a different office?—The chief inspector corresponds to what they call in England a divisional inspector. We call them in Scotland chief inspectors.

15973. There are five chief inspectors?—And of them I am the senior inspector.

15974. So you are senior of the five chief inspectors?—Yes.

15975. And you have a special district of your own?—I have a district of my own, my division comprises the four Northern Counties of Caithness, Sutherland, Inverness and Ross, with the Hebrides of the two latter counties.

15976. You have entire control of that district?—Yes, and I have a number of colleagues working with me there.

15977. How many junior inspectors have you under you?—There are eight junior inspectors on the Department's list; but I have no one of that grade with me. At times I get help from neighbouring districts. In this division there are several sub-inspectors and two district inspectors. One of the latter gives only part service to my division.

15978. Are those sub-inspectors promoted to the higher ranks?—Well, there have been cases, but it is not the custom. There are two grades of sub-inspectors. There are sub-inspectors of second class and sub-inspectors of first class, and there have been cases where first class sub-inspectors have been promoted to the rank of full inspectors.

F

15th July, 1918.]

Mr. J. L. ROBERTSON, LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

12079. Are the sub-inspectors generally University men?—The recent men are practically all University men.

12080. Are they required to have experience in teaching?—Yes, all of them have to have that.

12081. And you have a system of training inspectors?—There is no system of formal training at all. Inspectors are not appointed by competition in Scotland. In all grades they are appointed by selection and nomination by the Department. They simply apply to the Department. Their record is carefully looked into, and then they are appointed to the ordinary staff.

12082. Are the vacancies advertised?—No, they are not advertised, but they are practically very well known, and there is always on our office lists a very large number of applicants—of course, private applicants for the time being.

12083. What is the initial salary may I ask?—The sub-inspector begins at £150, and rises to £200; that is the sub-inspector of the second class. The sub-inspector of the first class, who is promoted from those of the second class, rises to £250. Then the junior inspector begins with £300, and rises to £450, which latter sum is the initial salary of a full inspector. The district inspector (which is the next grade as it were to the chief inspector) begins at £400 and rises to £500; and the chief inspector rises to £600.

12084. Now, are men retained long in the same district, or are they moved about?—There is a considerable amount of moving about, but not until they have got a pretty good grasp of the district, say, in six or seven years, and in many cases men are there for a very long time, partly at their own wish I should say, and partly from their suitability for the particular district. In the North of Scotland we have a number who speak the Gaelic language, because we use Gaelic as a help in some of the outlying parts.

12085. There is bilingual teaching, I think?—There is a considerable amount of that. Probably the Gaelic-speaking men know the conditions very well. I think we have nearly ten men on the staff who speak Gaelic fluently. I speak Gaelic myself.

12086. I suppose most of them have spoken it as children?—Yes, especially those brought up in the Highlands.

12087. It was dying out when I was there 20 years ago?—No doubt it is dying out fast.

12088. There is a very great difference between the Scotch system and the Irish system, and I do not think it is necessary to go into that, because I do not think it will assist our inquiry; but I understand that in the grading of your schools you have primary, intermediate and secondary schools?—Yes.

12089. I take it that the age for the primary school is the ordinary age up to 14, and according to the subjects laid down it corresponds to our primary schools in Ireland?—Five to fourteen is the statutory school age in Scotland.

12090. Then there are certain regulations, as I see from this book, which apply to all these grades as to the grants that are made. Is not that so?—Yes.

12091. Certain general regulations?—Yes.

12092. Now, will you tell us in a word or two on what principle aid from the Government is given to a local school, whether that school be primary, intermediate, or secondary? Well, the common point, so far as similarity with regard to all schools in Scotland is concerned is that Imperial grants are given to aid local effort. No one can possibly understand the Scotch system of education on its financial side without having that fact thoroughly apprehended.

12093. The local aid is raised by rates?—By rate mostly, and, in fact, the system has descended to us from very early times; local aid was always given in some form to education. Imperial grants are actually given at this moment in aid of local exertion. See Code, Art. 3.

12094. What is the proportion of one to the other?—I think that the State is to the disadvantage in the matter. We do not deal with the money raised locally in the shape of rate.

12095. You cannot tell just at once what is the proportion?—Later on I can give the exact proportion.*

12096. Now, what are the conditions for receiving the Imperial grant?—These are laid down in the Code, which is virtually an enactment of Parliament; it has to be in draft form on the table of the House of Commons for a full month, and then becomes practically law. Generally the conditions are that the school is conducted in accordance with the terms of Article 6, which embodies a Conscience Clause. Thus the school must not be conducted for private profit in any shape whatever, and must not be financed out by the managers to the teacher. The managers must be responsible for the payment to the teacher and all the other expenses of the school, financially responsible. Then the premises must be in a thoroughly sanitary condition, etc.

12097. May I ask this question. Is the local authority absolutely responsible for the condition of the building and the equipment?—Yes, the local authority is responsible, the School Board for public schools, the private managers for denominational or other schools.

12098. Have no cases at all been known where a teacher has been required to contribute to that in any shape or form?—Not in modern times. That would be a very gross sample of favouring.

12099. Is there any definite regulation prohibiting the teacher from doing so?—It is just this, that the teacher is set in this matter at all. The premises must be healthy, well lighted, clean, warm and well ventilated, supplied with sufficient officers, and containing sufficient accommodation for the children attending the school. On the Board or managers rests this responsibility.

12100. As to the duties of the inspectors, will you explain that a little, they are officers employed to collect information, and their principal duty is to see whether all those conditions are complied with for receiving the grant?—Yes.

12101. And that includes the examination of the schools?—Yes.

12102. Now, can you give us a description of your mode of inspection?—You have incidental visits, I see?—Yes.

12103. And you have formal inspection?—Yes. There is no fixed time of the year when that inspection may take place.

12104. Is there a uniform school year?—There is a uniform school year for financial purposes only. For inspection purposes the thing is quite variable, and in practice, in a district where the inspector knows the conditions, the schools may be visited, not within the same month, but pretty much within the same general period of the year.

12105. Does that mean that the school has its own year as a rule?—The school year is from the autumn vacation, that is from the re-opening of the school after the autumn vacation, but there is no fixed date for inspection of the school. The inspector visits it any time irrespective of the financial year, and then he examines the school on what is called the record of the work of the school. That is a great point with us.

12106. There is a strict rule laid down that each inspector's formal examination must be on the record of the school kept in the log book?—Yes, and the syllabus or scheme of work submitted by the teacher or manager to the inspector must have his signed approval.

12107. In your experience how many of those programmes have been submitted to you by the local authority for your approval?—Every school has its own scheme of work.

12108. Is own scheme?—Yes, and the management (and in that I am including the teachers, of course), in the preparation of the scheme have a very large amount of discretion. They submit to us what they consider a useful scheme of work.

12109. And has the inspector absolute power of approving or disapproving of the scheme, or does it go to any other higher authority?—I have never heard of it going further than the inspector. He generally arranges the matter by correspondence, or by personal

* See 12394.

conference with the teacher. I am speaking of the Primary schools.

16010. So that you arrange the programme between you?—Yes; the great point of the modern system of Scotch education is that the teacher is so much concerned in setting and estimating the work of the school as the inspector. In other words, his estimate of things is of very great help and importance to us.

16011. So the work of inspection?—Very much, indeed. In certain examinations later on, which I may explain to you, he is practically a co-examiner with us.

16012. When are the promotions made and by whom?—They are made entirely on the responsibility of the managers and the teacher. The teacher, as a matter of practice, is entirely responsible.

16013. And does he do that once a year?—At least, and oftener, sometimes.

16014. Is the manager present when the inspector inspects the school?—Sometimes; we occasionally invite him to be present.

16015. You give him notice?—Sometimes, when there is any matter of more than formal importance to be seen to; but as a rule we do not give notice.

16016. You do not give notice to the teacher or managers?—Often no notice at all.

16017. Of a formal inspection?—Well, that is different. We may give notice of a formal inspection.

16018. And I suppose the inspector examines schools that are less efficient more than others?—More frequently. The idea is to do the best we can for our district, and that will imply going to a more or less inefficient school oftener than once or twice a year.

16019. And a highly efficient school will not be visited so often?—Quite so, and I should even have no hesitation if we were pressed for work in any particular year in simply not inspecting at all a school which was of established repute and of stable efficiency.

16020. As a result of this inspection, in what way do you mark the school or the teacher in Scotland?—You send a report up to the Central Office?—Yes.

16021. What form does that report take?—We never have any definite predication of marks, except so far as to say in a general way that a school is "very good" or "good," or otherwise. We have nothing as it were like a label for the whole school.

16022. There is nothing laid down for you in the shape of a definite label to be applied to a certain school?—No. A very large proportion of our grants are paid, not on the written report of the inspection, but on the average attendance of the school. There is a small margin allowed to us to mark what I might call exceptional efficiency or exceptional inferiority at various stages in normal circumstances. It is so small as not to affect the grant materially.

16023. The grant is sometimes withheld on an inspector's report being unsatisfactory?—I do not think it is ever actually withheld, except in the case of an extreme condition of things that might affect the total efficiency of the school. We, at any rate, threaten occasionally, but the Department, I must say (I don't know that I am quite entitled to say it), are very considerate if we get a promise of amendment from the managers. When they write up protesting against a reduction of grant we almost invariably remit the reduction if we get a distinct undertaking from them.

16024. What is the procedure when the teacher or manager complains and appeals against the judgment of the inspector?—That is so extremely rare that all I know is the regulation in the Code that the Department then ask the chief inspector to make a special report.

16025. Then send the chief inspector?—Yes.

16026. And is that report of his final?—The Department's decision is final.

16027. Now I see in page 6 of these regulations that you lay great stress on what in our Irish circulars is called tone, the whole discipline and intellectual tone of the school?—Yes.

16028. You lay greater stress on that than on the actual book knowledge of the children?—It is a commonplace of our reports to speak of the good tone of a school, but we do not attach anything of pre-eminent importance to it, except that it is a point in the general efficiency of the school. We do not give it any exclusive prominence.

16029. Mr. KERR.—What do you understand by tone—is it one of the undefinable things?—Of course, there might be different explanations of that. I go into school A and school B. School B has a greater number of children that have more abnormal advantages, better homes, etc. In A I find the children are very alert and courteous, and go about their work as if they had pleasure in it, but in B, probably owing entirely to the style of the teacher, who may be quite as efficient and as good a man in all the leading points of moral character as the teacher of A, we find that the children work more from a sense of imposed authority, that they do it more from the drill-sergeant point of view. It is very difficult to define it, but I would say that the tone in the other (A) is better; it is more a sort of honest freedom and cheerfulness, with, of course, quite as good discipline as in B.

16030. There is only one other question I have to ask you. In giving one of those higher examinations to a less efficient school, do you examine all the children individually?—I should say that if the school were inefficient we would look through it in every particular.

16031. The written work?—The written work, and through all stages. For instance, if we found that arithmetic had become bad in the school, we should start from the infant school, as we would be sure there was something wrong in the method somewhere. We would work up and try to find the weak spot. Then have a talk with the teacher about things, and try to improve the school in that way, as well as by formal official report.

16032. Mr. HARRISON.—Might I ask you one or two questions. I see you put down the elementary scores 5 to 12. I presume that only means when children propose to carry on their education after the age of 14?—Five to 12, of course, covers the three divisions of the school, the infant division, the junior division, and the senior division.

16033. But then the children do not stay after 12?—They stay after 12. By that time they are supposed to take the qualifying examination, and from that other go into the supplementary course or the intermediate.

16034. Will the supplementary course and the intermediate course be in a primary school?—The latter not usually in a primary school, but in a particular intermediate school.

16035. But it may be in a primary school?—It may be. There is no "elementary" school in Scotland; the term is not known to us, officially as a classification of a school.

16036. What happens to the children over 12 who were unfortunate at the qualifying examination?—They have to be kept on in the senior division of the school. There always will be a small proportion who from mental weakness or otherwise fail to pass right off.

16037. This qualifying examination is taken at the age of 12?—Yes, never 15 for most.

16038. Who conducts it?—We conduct it. It is, as a matter of fact, the sole survivor of the old system of more or less individual examination. It is individual examination, and is a very special one in common practice.

16039. Is that held at central?—Sometimes in towns it is so held as a matter of convenience; usually it is held in each school on the day of inspection.

16040. Then it is absolutely certain under those circumstances that visits should be paid to all these out-of-the-way schools every year?—Yes.

16041. And that qualifying examination may be at one school in February and at another in April. Is that quite fair to the children?—The teacher, as a rule, writes when he has got them ready for inspection. The districts come to have more or less of an understanding, and the examination is generally conducted well on in the school session, at any time from May till the end of July.

16042. I did not quite understand your answer to Sir Samuel Dill about the year. You have one financial year?—Yes.

16043. Have you one educational year?—We have an educational year, from the re-assembling of the school after the autumn holiday.

16044. All promotions would be made after the summer vacation?—Yes, after the autumn vacation throughout the session at any time.

15th July, 1913.]

Mr. J. L. ROBERTSON, LL.D., continued.

[Continued.]

16045. But the majority would be made then when the new work would begin after the summer vacation?—Yes, there would be a re-arrangement of classes certainly in the first fortnight.

16046. And, then, what is the intermediate certificate?—The intermediate certificate marks the successful completion of an organized stage of secondary education. I may just say that the qualifying examination is the passport into the course called the intermediate certificate.

16047. Or into the supplementary?—Or into the supplementary. While the intermediate curriculum is the beginning, as it were, of secondary education, and the supplementary course is the continuing of elementary education in the case of boys leaving at 14, the qualifying examination serves as a passport for both the supplementary and the intermediate course. English is one of the subjects common to both courses in the intermediate course. English must be one of the subjects, and, as a rule, a language other than English.

16048. The CHAIRMAN.—In what course is that?—The intermediate course. English must be a subject with, as a rule, a language other than English; for instance, Latin or French, and in some places Gaelic; and then Mathematics, Science and Drawing. These are what you call, speaking broadly, the essential parts of an intermediate course. A boy would get an intermediate certificate at the end of his course, which is normally a three years' course, and then proceed to take the post-intermediate course, which leads up to University education.

16049. Where would the next course be taken—at an intermediate school?—As a rule at a secondary school or higher grade school with a five years' course. In a few primary schools the staff is competent enough to give the intermediate course, and it is given in a few such. Many, however, as "feeder" schools overtake a part of the course preparatory to transference of the pupil to a well-equipped centre.

16050. In the old times there were a great many schools where the staff was competent?—Yes.

16051. Mr. HARRISON.—And then those boys who go into the supplementary course have an examination called the certificate of merit?—Yes, on conditions.

16052. That is a sort of leaving certificate?—It is in a way the leaving certificate of the elementary school, and it is of value in other directions. For instance, the pupil may go to a continuation class. A boy wanting to be, say, an engineer goes into a continuation class.

16053. Which he could not enter without this certificate of merit?—He could enter it without the certificate, but with it he enters on a higher plane, and then he may get special instruction connected with his own work on several evenings in the week, and thereafter he may find his way to what is called a Central Institution of Technical University, and get the relative diploma.

16054. And those continuation classes, I take it, are always held in the evening?—There are very few day continuation classes.

16055. And the certificate of merit has a certain value in the eyes of employers, has it not?—Yes, it has, but its value and currency are under consideration at present.

16056. Then from the intermediate he goes into the leaving certificate course?—Yes.

16057. Where is that taken—in a secondary school?—In a secondary school.

16058. And that will be, I suppose, a continuation on a higher plane, of the same subjects?—Of the same subjects. I may say that the intermediate course is a course of general education of a secondary character. When the pupil comes to the post-intermediate course the managers may apply for certain alterations in the course, making it other than a purely University course.

16059. And then I see collateral with that there is a junior student class?—Yes.

16060. Is that for teachers?—Yes.

16061. Is that intended for those who are going to be teachers?—Yes.

16062. Where is the course taken?—Before a boy can be a junior student he must have got the intermediate certificate, and then he goes to the junior student centre for a course there of two or three years, three years as a rule; he then proceeds to the training centre, and the training is of various lengths. If he goes to a University he may take a four years' course, concurrently attending the Training College and the University, which is rather a common thing in Scotland. We have about 5,000 teacher graduates in Scotland, graduates of the University; but the two years' course at the training centre is the usual course if he wants to get back to the primary school teaching.

16063. Where is the junior course taken?—In the central school; that is in the post-intermediate course thereof.

16064. Are the junior students taught entirely by themselves or in class with other students?—They are taught very largely with secondary pupils, the ordinary secondary pupils who would go to the University, so that from the very beginning the young teacher is brought into touch with secondary education.

16065. And during that junior student course does he do any practical teaching?—A good deal, but we have to see that he does that under very careful supervision, and he is very closely examined every year as to that. A scheme of practical training has to be laid down. He goes through the school under the general supervision of the head master or master of method at certain times of the week and sees a considerable variety of classes.

16066. In his own school or in another school?—As a rule in his division in his own school, but in the big towns where they could not have a great number of junior students teaching in one school, say, 80 or 90 in one school at the same time, they divide them over the schools.

16067. Does he do any responsible teaching during that time?—Towards the end of his course he may, if he develops any considerable teaching ability.

16068. That means that during his practical work he must be to some extent withdrawn from his studies?—He is. There is a considerable difference of opinion upon this point just now. Undoubtedly it involves that.

16069. And there is some disadvantage in that?—It just depends upon whether he is to look mainly to the university as his ultimate goal or to teaching. If he is going to be a primary teacher, I should say that there is great advantage in it. In recent years we are always ready to consult with the managers or head teachers, and the head teacher invariably, I may say, is in favour of some time spent in practical training. Some teachers apply to us to get nice freedom in any particular season in arranging the work of junior students in relation to the work of the other secondary pupils. We are inclined to favour modifications in individual cases, keeping in view, of course, the destination of the student.

16070. That can be done?—That can be done to some extent, but we rather favour him getting a certain amount of steady systematic practical training throughout his course.

16071. At any rate habituating him to do a certain amount of teaching?—Yes.

16072. And that leads on to the training centre?—Yes.

16073. Or the University, as the case may be?—Yes.

16074. Are the training centres training colleges?—Training colleges in popular designation.

16075. And most of the students in training colleges, I presume, will really take the degree?—A large number of the male students do take the degree, but, most of the girl students leave at the end of two years, because they want to get employment soon.

16076. And what is the general certificate that they take?—The general certificate is the one that they take at the end of a two years' period in the training college, for work in primary schools, or at the end of three or four years with University attendance.

18th July, 1913.]

Mr. J. L. HENDERSON, LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

16077. And that qualifies a man as a full teacher?—Yes, as a full teacher, the general certificate.

16078. Then just at the top there are two others, a certificate in teach higher subjects and a certificate to teach special subjects?—Yes. The certificate to teach higher subjects means that the teacher must have been at the University, and he must have taken, if he wants to be a teacher of Latin or English, what we call honours in Latin or in English as the case may be, or other approved equivalent qualification, and if he has the general certificate, all the better for him; but we will not recognise in our secondary schools, and we are getting stricter in the matter, a teacher who, say, has honours in Latin, and has had no experience of teaching Latin. He may be as learned as possible, and yet not be able to teach Latin sensibly; so we aim at having all secondary teachers trained in the theory and practice needed in the teaching of their own subjects. The general certificate or an approved course of special professional training is laid down.

16079. And then what would be included under the term "special subjects"?—For instance, if a young lady teacher wanted to be a teacher of art in a school, we would insist on her having the Diploma of a recognised School of Art similarly for domestic science, etc.

16080. Domestic science?—Domestic science or art, specially.

16081. Or music?—Or music, or physical exercises, for instance.

16082. Do you understand the Irish system at all?—I cannot say that I do very well.

16083. You know, I presume, that the teachers are paid directly out of the Government grant?—Yes, I know that.

16084. Their salaries and their pensions are paid out of the grant, but the manager appoints?—Yes.

16085. Then they have a system of grading the teachers. Are you at all conversant with that?—Yes.

16086. Well, that necessitates, of course, labelling the schools and the teachers. I think you had some experience of a somewhat similar state of things in Scotland?—Yes, long years ago.

16087. It is more than 10 years ago, I presume?—Yes.

16088. And you know the way it worked out?—Well, of course, we had a first class certificate and a second class certificate and on to a fourth class certificate; parchment certificates.

16089. I mean the grading of schools and teachers each year?—Of schools?

16090. Hadn't you at one time in Scotland a system of marking schools "excellent" and "fair"?—In 1896, and for some years before, grants were graded in accordance of the school, and for certain subjects on the basis of "fair," "good," or "excellent" quality of the instruction, but the school itself was not so graded categorically.

16091. Did not some grant depend upon it?—Certainly; we increased the grant on a definite scale.

16092. You have nothing of that now?—Nothing, except a small variable margin left for excellence or inferiority.

16093. What was the objection that you found to that system?—Well, in the first place it was an exceedingly premature thing. There are many external disadvantages a school is subject to. You might have an epidemic, and you might have assistants coming into a school not so competent as those who had left, and many circumstances affected the appearance of a school which were accidental and not due to any neglect on the part of the teacher.

16094. But still an inspector who knew his work ought to be able to take those into account?—Yes, in a general way, and we all do that. We label in our mind a certain man as a very good teacher, so far as teacher.

16095. And did you find that real uniformity of judgment under that system was an easy thing?—No, it was certainly not.

16096. It was very difficult?—It was very difficult. 16097. And you yourself did not owe about the responsibility, I presume?—No.

16098. Now, one more point. These grades have certain increments, triennial increments?—Of salary?

16099. Of salary; and it has been proposed to substitute for these annual increments, but then supposing the increments were made annual, might not a little annually be better than a larger one triennially?—Well, it is obvious, of course, on Stock Exchange principles. It would be less, but the teacher would be more equably compensated in a certain sense.

16100. But annual would be preferable to triennial?—Yes, decidedly.

16101. Now, you told us how local interest in the schools was maintained in Scotland. Have you any voluntary schools left in Scotland?—Yes, a very considerable number of voluntary schools. Of primary schools in Scotland, 2,835 are public schools (i.e., under a School Board), and 816 are voluntary schools (denominational or others).

16102. And how are they managed?—They are managed, of course, being voluntary schools, by their own private managers and maintained by means of voluntary contributions with some State aid.

16103. And then they are managed by private managers?—Yes. We pay, of course, a public grant to them, but they get nothing from the rates. Only a school-board school gets anything from the rates. The Church of Scotland and other denominational schools used to get a large number of pupils, but the Presbyterian type of these schools is disappearing, and people prefer the school boards.

16104. They prefer the school boards?—Yes.

16105. Except the Roman Catholics?—Except the Roman Catholics. In Scotland, in 1911, there were 3,030 public schools, 233 Roman Catholic schools, 60 un denominational schools, 67 episcopal schools, 8 Church of Scotland schools, and 1 U. F. Church school.

16106. And they maintain their schools?—Yes, and it is currently reported, and one sees references to it in the newspapers, that there are attempts at joint working of even Roman Catholic schools as between their managers and the school boards.

16107. Is that by means of amalgamation?—The thing has not materialised in any definite sense, but one sees occasionally references to the fact, especially in Glasgow, that conferences are being held. I do not think anything has come of it yet, but the tendency will undoubtedly be to smooth away some of the difficulties. Whether it will ultimately do so I do not know.

16108. Mr. KERRIN.—The Catholics are not subsidised?—Not subsidised. The Catholics pay rates and get no subsidy from the rates.

16109. Mr. HENDERSON.—You are not at all affected by the Act of 1902, the Act which did away with school boards. That did not apply to Scotland in any way?—No.

16110. Would you have an ad hoc authority?—We have an ad hoc authority. There is a good deal of discussion which seems to grow in volume and intensity every year as to the advantages of amalgamation of school boards, in view of the expanding responsibility of school boards, for instance, with regard to school medical inspection and otherwise. There is talk of legislation for increasing the powers of school boards, and perhaps the larger idea may be administratively preferable.

16111. Have you heard that local interest in education is very least all over Scotland?—Yes.

16112. Do you think local interest is possible under a highly centralised system?—Except on a very carefully drawn scheme, I really do not see how they could work harmoniously together. I do not think a large subject like education can be thoroughly worked without a good deal of local interest. It is such a freeable question.

16113. In fact you consider that under a highly centralised system any very general interest would not be likely or possible?—That is my opinion, if the system be very highly centralised.

16114. I think you told Sir Samuel Dill about the method of selection of inspectors for Scotland. Here in Ireland they are partly appointed, at one time

15th July, 1918.]

Mr. J. L. ROBERTSON, LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

almost entirely) on examination. Would you consider that a satisfactory method?—No, I do not think so at all, because they are examined already in their University course. They are practically all men of good University standing, and I mean to say we do not need it. The more important thing to watch about a man is common sense, with some knowledge of teaching.

16115. And at what age as a rule are those appointments made for Scotland?—It varies. The sub-inspectors generally come in between 25 and 35. The junior inspectors likewise. I myself was appointed when I was 30 as an inspector, but perhaps I was one of the youngest.

16116. An inspector is not as a rule appointed till he is 25?—No, later than that.

16117. That is rather late to subject a man to examination?—Yes.

16118. You told us of two grades of sub-inspectors. Do sub-inspectors report to the Board?—No; they always report through their inspectors. But as a man gets experience and is reliable, and most of our men are very reliable, you think nothing of sending them to meet some of the managers and agree upon a general line as to school matters.

16119. The sub-inspector does not report immediately and directly?—No, the responsibility lies on the inspector.

16120. Now, I think some years ago you did as we did, abolish the individual examination under the results system?—Yes.

16121. Can you tell what in your opinion have been the gains and what the losses resulting from that abolition?—It is rather a long story. There is no one now in Scotland who would seek to go back to the old system of individual results inspection. It was an exceedingly mechanical thing. I have no doubt that in the old days it was of some service under the circumstances in which it was introduced, because in those days one must remember that you had a good many teachers of the old school, and you were pressing forward education in certain aspects, in accuracy and fulness of organisation and method. Gradually it came to be regarded as a system that was really not conducive to much initiative on the part of the teacher, and it led to a rigid mechanical style of work. One of the very great defects of it was that the pace had a mechanical value, and a lad who should have been promoted would sometimes be kept back to mark time in the class because he was sure to bring money next year. That alone was a serious condemnation. And one must remember that in Scotland compulsion of school attendance is an old established thing; from the year I believe 1496, probably the first case in Europe, barons and land owners were compelled to send their eldest sons to grammar schools to perfect themselves in Latin, and thereafter down to now we have compulsion.

16122. The CHAIRMAN.—When do you say it began?—In 1496, in the reign of James IV.

16123. You have robbed John Knox of one of his glories?—This was long before John Knox.

16124. The BARRON or BARR.—The Papist system was then in existence?—Yes; indeed Scotland owes an incalculable debt to the Churches both before and after the Reformation.

16125. Mr. KETTER.—Do the barons and land owners perfect their sons in Latin nowadays?—I don't know about that; but you see the idea of compulsion was familiar to us. School boards or no school boards, the idea of compulsion was readily assimilated under the Act of 1872.

16126. Mr. HARRISON.—You think the results examination was necessary when it was introduced in order to secure a greater amount of general accuracy?—I would not say that it was quite necessary, but I think it was desirable to apply a stimulus to the state of education throughout the country. I think a short time of it was not a bad thing in that way.

16127. We might not fit in this way, that it was a sort of purgatory that we had to pass through to paradise?—Yes.

16128. In any case you are perfectly convinced that it was quite right to abolish it?—Yes.

16129. And in fact it might have been abolished long before it was?—Yes, I think so.

16130. In your experience are there any losses?—I really think the advantages immensely outweigh any disadvantages.

16131. We have had a certain amount of evidence that there has been a considerable lessening of inaccuracy in arithmetic?—That is true, but a great deal of the accuracy in arithmetic was got out of a most unreasonable waste of time. Children were taught to solve arithmetical problems which they never did meet in after life, while they would be totally unable to give accurately answers in everyday oral arithmetic.

16132. And I imagine that this evidence you are giving is practically the opinion of all your colleagues?—I think so. At the same time I think we sometimes let the pendulum swing too far in the matter of arithmetic, and a little more focused arithmetic might be given. We never hesitate to do that when we find the tendency to oral arithmetic has been unduly pressed.

16133. Have you had in Scotland any complaints from employers of labour about children being less accurate in arithmetic and spelling?—Those complaints are occasionally heard.

16134. Have you ever been at the pains to investigate any of those yourself?—Yes, and to point out the enormous advantage of collateral subjects, such as education, English history and geography, nature study, drawing, etc., and that practically the schools are producing, from the point of view of social efficiency, a more valuable product than they were when arithmetic was predominant.

16135. Have you ever investigated any special cases of that sort of complaint yourself?—Not any special cases, though one has had talks with people.

16136. But you are satisfied that there is very little in those complaints?—I do not think that there is much in them, and I think that the general results of the present system are immensely superior in a broad and genuinely educational sense.

16137. Now, one or two questions with regard to administration. What is the method of drawing up reports in your Scottish Office?—Of course, I am an outdoor officer, and I can only speak in a general way in answer to that. They go into the office and are considered by the committees there, and they are looked into.

16138. Who are the examiners?—I think there are six examiners in our office just now, men of university standing. They are told off occasionally to go round to places in Scotland and see the actual work of inspection.

16139. With an inspector?—With an inspector.

16140. But not as inspectors in any case?—We occasionally give them a class or school. They have a very good knowledge of some of the outdoor work. They look over the reports, and they communicate with you if necessary or expedient, and then the matter goes from the educational side of our office into the Treasury side.

16141. If there is anything that would require clearing up, that prima facie would seem to require reference they would refer to the reporting inspector for adjustment?—Yes, that is the inevitable rule.

16142. And you think that system works thoroughly well?—Yes, I think so.

16143. Have you any reason to think that these examiners should be experts?—In what way experts?

16144. Do you think that the work would be better done supposing you brought into the office as examiners people who had had previous experience as inspectors?

—Well, some men in our office have been inspectors. 16145. Is there any necessity for being an inspector?—I do not think there is any necessity for it at all. I think a good deal of the talk about expert knowledge is overdone. I do not think educational work is such an intricate thing at all.

16146. You have said that these inside officials occasionally go round with an inspector so as to get some knowledge of the school, and do any of the official staff ever visit schools on their own account?—Visit schools?

16147. Yes?—They would never think of doing that without communicating with the inspector.

1916 July, 1913.]

Mr. J. L. ROBERTSON, LL.D., examined.

[Continued.]

16148. Sir John Struthers?—Yes, he has been sound with me several times all over the Highlands.

16149. Does he ever go alone?—I think not; certainly in the big cities he is frequently inside a school, with the inspector usually, if not always.

16150. Does he ever express an opinion on the schools do you know?—I do not think so, in the sense in which I take your question. I think he would leave that to the inspector.

16151. You have never known a case of his reporting on a school or in any sense interfering with the work of the inspector?—No; if there were a difficult case of conflict between the examiner and the inspector, which is so rare that I can hardly recall a case in my own experience, then the matter would go in to Sir John Struthers to look into. He was a trained teacher himself.

16152. And as inspector?—And as inspector. He was trained in the training college. I do not think he taught long before he went to Oxford. He went from Glasgow.

16153. Mr. KATZEL.—Is he the permanent secretary?—Yes.

16154. Mr. HARRISON.—Do you know of any instance in which Sir John Struthers has ever investigated a case himself?—I have not the slightest doubt that he has often looked into cases.

16155. But that he has gone to a school with the idea of satisfying himself as to whether the inspector was right or not?—I have never heard of such a thing.

16156. And his visits would be mainly for his own information, to keep in touch with the schools?—Yes; for instance, he indicated to me some time ago that he is likely to go round with me on a visit to Highland schools this autumn.

16157. And does he discuss schools with you?—Yes, and also general matters connected with education.

16158. But he would in no case endeavour to influence your report?—Oh, no.

16159. He would consider that that would be outside his duty?—Yes, outside his practice, certainly.

16160. And if he did that, he would not be very popular among your colleagues?—Well, I should say that as long as human nature is as it is that would be so. But we do not regard him as very detached from ourselves.

16161. Now, do you issue circulars to inspectors?—Do the Department?

16162. Yes?—Yes, occasionally, not frequently.

16163. Pointing out to them their duties and that sort of thing?—Well, in a general way. This brochure in my hand is a collection of circulars. When there is any new movement in policy embodied in the Code it is almost invariably preceded a good length of time by an explanatory circular.

16164. I do not know whether you have read all the circulars issued by the National Board to their inspectors?—I ran through a collection of them some weeks ago.

16165. Did you happen to come across one where the inspectors were told that they were expected to be patient with the children and courteous to the teacher?—No, I did not come across that. I should be rather surprised to find that.

16166. How would that sort of circular be received in Scotland?—I should say with a good deal of amusement.

16167. It certainly shows a considerable distrust, does it not?—Surely that is implied in it. The whole spirit of our work (I will put it in a word in speaking of the inspectors) is in the spirit of camaraderie between inspectors and teachers.

16168. And Sir John Struthers often has conferences?—Yes, I have just come from Sir John Struthers's conference. He frequently summons the chief inspectors up to meet him. We had a long conference lasting a whole day on various points connected with both the present and the future. Of course, these are confidential so far.

16169. What do you do when you contemplate a change in the regulations—what advice do you give?—This code is revised and is laid on the table of the House of Commons for a month before issue.

16170. That is the same practice as in England?—Yes; it is there for a month, and then it virtually becomes an enactment; but, of course, much depends on the way in which it is administered.

16171. But do you give any opportunity to managers or educational experts or teachers to discuss any considerable changes beforehand?—Not formally, but long before any large change is stereotyped in the code there is ample warning that such a change is imminent, so that, perhaps, in a school by the Department to managers. Managers go to our office in Edinburgh and have a conference there with Sir John Struthers or with our Assistant Secretary. We have a resident Assistant Secretary in Edinburgh, and I should say that a very large part of his time is taken up in conferences with managers and members of educational institutes in Scotland, with teachers' associations, secondary school associations, and anyone interested in any particular point you there and talks the matter over.

16172. In fact you rather invite and welcome the discussion of any important changes that may be in contemplation. That is so?—Yes.

16173. The CHAIRMAN.—These regulations are laid on the table of the House of Commons?—Yes.

16174. Are they ever challenged?—Not often.

16175. Whose business would it be to defend them if they were?—The business of the Vice-President of our Committee of Council on Education in Scotland.

16176. He has a seat in Parliament?—He is the Secretary for Scotland; he is our Minister of Education, so to speak.

16177. He would be bound to defend them?—He would be bound to do his best to meet discussion.

16178. Now, with regard to your programmes, how are they framed?—You mean schemes of work?

16179. Yes, what are called programmes here?—They are written out by the teacher and sent on to the inspector.

16180. Have you any suggested scheme in your code?—We have, for what are called supplementary schools, but they are mere exemplars. They are not intended to be enforced on anyone.

16181. You have compulsory subjects, of course?—Yes.

16182. And these subjects it is open to a teacher to teach any way he likes, of course, subject to criticism of his methods afterwards?—There is a very great deal of latitude in our system, but the beneficial result from all this great latitude is that there is a certain voluntary uniformity.

16183. But as a rule the inspector will give the widest possible latitude to the teacher?—Yes, a great deal.

16184. And he is a friendly critic?—Yes, there is a constant communication, and my own advice to my colleagues who work along with me is to avoid writing as much as possible, and simply go to the school and meet the man. A personal conference is the strong point with me.

16185. Now, you have a number of quite small country schools?—A very great number in my division.

16186. Are those taught mostly by men or by women?—Very largely by women now. In the old days there were a great many men in very small schools, because, of course, mainly men were employed in the old times, but now a young fellow who gets brushed up in a training college or university will not go to a small school. But we have very efficient women teachers now.

16187. Of course, it is a great advantage for the younger children to have a woman teacher?—Yes; we have a great many young women teachers teaching schools of 50 and 60.

16188. Not entirely unaided?—No, they have usually an assistant to help them.

16189. Have you any difficulty with the younger boys in Scotland?—I don't think so; it is very rare. We often speak about the courtesy of the children, especially in the outlandish places, but I should say it is very different when you come to the large industrial centres.

16190. The CHAIRMAN.—Your Highland boys are well-mannered boys?—They are.

16191. Mr. HARRISON.—You mentioned a school of 50 or 60. What assistance would the teacher have?—That school might have a certificated assistant. In fact we shall have no untrained teachers in Scotland after next year.

16192. In a school of 50 children you have two trained teachers?—Yes, two trained teachers.

16193. What is the limit of numbers for a single-teacher school?—50 an average attendance under the code, which does not, of course, correspond to the average number on the roll. Our County Committees have a fund at their disposal for helping the managers to staff the schools liberally.

16194. That is voluntary managers?—Voluntary managers also participate.

16195. Then to some small extent voluntary managers do get something out of the rates?—The money is imperial, not local. The subsidies for staff are small. In the case, say, of a school of about 70 the County Committee would give £80 or £90 towards the salary.

16196. And after this year you will have no teachers below the rank of certificated trained teachers?—Yes, that will soon be realised in Scotland.

16197. Have you any people now serving with no qualifications?—Yes, we have, and we must tolerate some for a while yet; but hereafter none will be recognised.

16198. Now, I presume you have a good many country schools of about 50?—Yes.

16199. That is rather much for one woman to manage, but there is hardly scope for two trained teachers?—There is no real scope, and 30 is not too many for one woman teacher if she can keep discipline and has the art to employ the children, the older especially, without constantly talking to them. To develop initiative, children should be left to independent work in a reasonable measure; and their studies directed by the teacher. They are too much lectured at in many schools nowadays. An important faculty is not stimulated.

16200. The power of self work?—The power of self work. A valuable feature of a good system with regard to the higher classes, for instance, is that while teaching in the lower class is going on a boy would be set to read a particular passage and afterwards reproduce it as an exercise in composition.

16201. In that country school there would probably be 5 or 6 of them under 7?—Yes.

16202. They would be rather troublesome unless she got some assistance?—Yes, but I think a teacher of some resource may be able to give exercises that will keep them quiet and well employed.

16203. Now, with regard to these small country schools, children very often travel considerable distances?—Long distances in Scotland.

16204. Have you any system of conveying them?—Yes, we have a provision in our new Act, 1908, that it is permissible from the school fund to pay the cost of conveyance or to pay the cost of lodging at a centre in the case of very distant children.

16205. Now, you mentioned Roman Catholic schools. There are a good many in the Highlands or parts of the Highlands?—A fair number.

16206. Are the different schools often close together, a small Protestant and a small Catholic school?—We have a few examples of that. A striking fact is that in the Islands of South Uist and Barra the proportion of Catholics is very large, and there are no Catholic schools, only the Public schools. For many years I was manager in connection with them under a special arrangement made with the Department for financial and administrative reasons, mainly the former. The school finances utterly broke down in these highly-remote parishes, and we faced a complete educational collapse. Under the arrangement (by special licence) we helped generously by direct Government subsidy to relieve or wipe out serious deficiency as it emerged but we insisted on having a hand in the routine administration. By agreement I became co-manager of each school in the area with other two managers nominated by the School Board. Until the special arrangement terminated by notice on our part, it worked most harmoniously. Now and then there

was some question of the Cessation Clause or of denominational staffing, but over a long course of years the extreme conflict was never materially disturbed.

16207. In fact in Scotland you found no difficulty in working perfectly well together?—No difficulty at all in this case.

16208. The CURRIER.—You know the district of Harris. There is considerable population there?—Yes, all Protestant schools.

16209. I remember seeing a splendid new school there, and the children coming down from the hills and no road at all?—We think it is better to have no road at all than a very muddy broken-up one. The children prefer the heather.

16210. Mr. HARRISON.—You gave Sir Samuel some information about the promotion of children. Here is a rule in the Irish regulations which I will read to you: "All promotions of pupils should date from the beginning of the school year." That reads as an absolute rule. How would you regard that?—That appears to mean that there are to be promotions only at the beginning of the school session. Supposing promotion has taken place in the senior class at the beginning of the session, and a boy who is promoted is a good student, studies his home lessons well, and gets on well, we should think it wrong for that scholar to be denied promotion again in the session.

16211. And therefore do you regard that rule as a bad rule?—I do not think it was made with a bad intention; I think it was made on the general principle that promotions should be systematic.

16212. But at any rate you would object to a teacher being debarré from promoting except at the beginning of the year?—Certainly.

16213. And would you tell us generally what are your views with regard to keeping children down, keeping them another year in the same class?—If a boy has not aptitude for education, I think it is very unfortunate to put him into a higher sphere, if he cannot have any profit by it. Of course, repetition is not a thing that children like, and I would be disposed often to put the boy further up, hoping that the novelty of the situation might develop or strike some new vein of intellectual effort.

16214. Especially if the boy was very much older than the average?—I would have no hesitation, particularly if he were within the range of the practical education of the supplementary course. The boy might be a duffer in English subjects, but he might be a very good craftsman.

16215. In the interests of the State in such cases out of ten he ought to be promoted?—Yes.

16216. What are the salaries that teachers get in these small country schools?—They vary much, but not in that part of the Highlands with which I am connected. You must always remember that local resources have to meet a large part of the cost. There is a good deal of criticism of the expenditure, the rates being high in these districts, and the valuations small enough.

16217. Would not the sum required from local resources be rather more than half?—No; much less than half.

16218. Could you put in a little statement of the salaries in the small country schools?—Yes; I could not tell you more at present than this:—Salaries range from £80 to £110 for men and £55 to £80 for women head teachers in small schools.

16219. What would be the size of the schools?—Anything up to 65 on the roll. The population is falling fast in many of these districts owing to emigration. There are 34 children probably in average attendance when you have 30 on the roll. As to salaries, I know a Highland parish where the head master has £145, and there are four assistants, and none of these assistants are under £70, rising to £80. In the school of ——— with an average of 108, the head master has £130 and a free house and garden. Then there is another with 181 average and £150 salary; and so on. Then in a small school with 80 of average attendance you may have a female teacher with £70, rising to £80.

16220. I thought that the rule was that no head teacher should have less than £100?—No head male teacher.

16221-2. Would some of these men be university graduates?—Some of them are. At the Bath of Lewis there is a school with roll of 668 children, and the head master has £160. He is a graduate of Aberdeen University, and he has five assistants.

16223. £160 in those Islands would be very high pay?—That is what a lot of the Island people think. It is more than some clergymen get.

16224. The Bursar or Rector.—Or the medical man?—Yes, as fixed salary in some parishes.

16225. The CHAIRMAN.—Would not a man with £160 a year in North Lewis be better off than a man with £200 in St. Andrews?—£160 would, with house, rent and rate free, go as far with him than £200 in St. Andrews at any rate.

16226. Mr. HARRISON.—Your limit of school age of from 5 to 12?—5 to 14. We began with 5 to 10 and raised it.

16227. Then do you allow children to be admitted under 5?—Yes, we allow them to be admitted; we pay the grant from 3 to 13; but no one is bound to send his child before 5 or to return him after 14.

16228. Do you encourage the children to stay?—We do encourage them; the nature of the country prevents very early and regular attendance in many parts; but we are very glad to get them in at 5 years of age; we are very pleased indeed in remote districts.

16229. Have you any experience of schools being rather overrun with babies under 5?—No, not in the Highlands; but a feeling is growing up in industrial centres in favour of a creche system.

16230. Have you in connection with any of your large town schools anything in the way of a creche?—I think there is some attempt at that; but I am not very conversant with it.

16231. You would not know whether there are many children under 5 years old in Glasgow schools?—No, I could not easily tell that. There are some places where mothers have to go to work, as a matter of industrial necessity.

16232. Are there any complaints in Scotland of children leaving school before they have been able to secure employment?—Yes, there is always a good deal of complaint in some districts about this, but it is combated very much in Scotland in recent years, because we do not now grant labour certificates.

16233. I was rather referring to children leaving at 14 without having secured employment, and then they begin to loaf?—There is a regrettable amount of that in some districts.

16234. Has anything been done to try to head that off?—Well, we try by means of stimulating continuation classes. Those continuation classes are subsidised generously by the Department. It is one of the great points that we have to tackle in Scotland in the future, the continuation class system in rural districts. The School Bureau is likely to help greatly.

16235. Do a large number of children insist on leaving directly they arrive at an age which exempts them?—Yes, in some districts. I think that is a matter that is most noticeable where the educational pace is, so to speak, slack; but parents wish them to stay on longer if they think they are going to get a bursary and go into a secondary school.

16236. Have you in your Scottish Department any expert adviser on school buildings?—Yes, we have an architect. One of our officials is a trained architect.

16237. And every building plan?—I must go through his hands.

16238. Has to be submitted to him and approved by him?—Yes, we have rules and regulations of a very stringent character, and managers are on no account allowed to build without submitting the plans.

16239. What is your minimum sized room?—In Scotland lately owing to the provisions of the code limiting the number of children who can be taught by one teacher there is a great re-organisation of the interior accommodation going on. Rooms about this size are not at all uncommon, and our difficulty is to

get partitions into rooms which were built some time ago. You cannot interfere with the building so you have to go in for moveable partitions, and expedients of that kind. The whole question of the building is rapidly coming within the range of medical considerations. We had an interesting conference the other day in Edinburgh of all the School Board Officers, where there was a very strong indictment against the existing type of school building, which was seldom built, as an architect should build it, with regard to modern hygienic principles. There is no doubt that these principles are to have a very important influence on building and furnishing.

16240. One great object, I presume, is never to have two classes taught together, that is, taught in the same room?—Certainly in big schools you can avoid that, but you cannot always avoid it in the small schools.

16241. Would you have rooms about 15 feet?—I do not think any school in Scotland would object to rooms of this size, but we object to rooms of same size, I cannot tell the exact measurement.

16242. You cannot tell what the limit is?—Not at the moment, but I could give it to you.

16243. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Have you got anything in the Scotch system like our Resident Commissioner-ship?—No.

16244. Do you at all know what the Resident Commissioner's position is in Ireland?—I have no clear idea.

16245. You mentioned Sir John Strathairn?—Yes, he is our Permanent Secretary.

16246. What is his position?—He is permanent secretary of the Scotch Education Department.

16247. Has he got a seat on the Board?—No, he is the secretary of the Committee of Council on Education in Scotland.

16248. You talked about the Department. You have a Board of Education in Scotland?—No, we have not a Board of Education there; only a branch office. The main office is in London. We have no body that is called a Board of Education. We have simply the Scotch Education Department, which up to 1866, when it became a totally separate national Department, was united with the English Department; it was the Scotch side of the Education Department, housed in Whitehall.

16249. Mr. KERRAN.—It seems a curious thing. What proportion of the administrative business of the office is done in London and what proportion in Edinburgh?—Edinburgh takes charge specially of questions connected with secondary education and the training of teachers. In London they deal with questions connected with elementary education and superannuation, and a variety of cognate subjects, but the great justification put forward for having an office in London is that our secretary is in constant and immediate touch with the Vice-President, who is virtually the head of our Department.

16250. Would the inspectors' reports go to the London office?—The inspectors' reports upon one branch go there direct, that is those connected with finance, staffing, accommodation, and educational working of the primary school; but those connected with secondary education and the training of teachers go to Edinburgh. Our Secretary often has meetings there with school boards, and deputations of all kinds, and frequently meetings with the chief inspectors of schools, who hold conferences in their respective districts with their own staff and discuss local educational interests with them.

16251. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Would you approve of a voluntary Board of Education, like what we have in Ireland, of a body of unpaid members who compose the Board of Education and are practically responsible for primary education in Ireland?—I think that the system at present in Scotland works very well indeed in view of the close touch it maintains with, as it were, every part of the country through the staff of inspectors and chief inspectors, and also with Parliament and the Treasury in London.

16252. You understand the position that Dr. Stokely occupies in this country, that he is a member of the

18th July, 1913.]

Mr. F. L. ROBERTSON, LL.D., *continued*.

[Continued.]

Board, and is also the Chief Executive Officer of the Board. Would you consider that a good position?—I cannot give a definite opinion on that. No doubt it suits the circumstances here.

16268. You think it is essential that there should be some representative in Parliament to answer for the Education Department?—I think it gives very great strength to any Department. It gives besides an opportunity for criticism of the working of the Department.

16269. There is a Government grant for education in Scotland. Do you get a grant for buildings?—We get loans from the Government now, but no grant. In the early days after 1872 remote places got a free grant. In 10 years there was close on seven millions spent on buildings all over the country.

16270. Would the Government give a grant without local contribution?—Not local contribution in the case of loans, but only repayment of the interest and capital, generally over 30 to 40 years. Capital expenditure is met by loan, repayment being equitably spread over a long period.

16271. Now, who appoint the managers?—The School Board may delegate its powers to three managers for any particular school: the School Board is elected by the ratepayers on a cumulative vote, and membership and management lapse at the end of the statutory life of the Board—three years. The number of members of the School Board varies from 5 to 25, five being the minimum number for a small parish; 25 is maximum, and is, of course, for important centres.

16272. That is the full Board, but has not each school got its own managers?—The School Board may appoint three managers, but this is optional. They delegate usually all powers except the power of raising money or dismissing teachers; of that power they cannot divest themselves.

16273. The School Board also can dismiss the manager?—Yes, they can recall a manager or managers at any time.

16274. Who dismisses or appoints the teacher?—The School Board or the managers that they have delegated the power of appointment to; but in regard to dismissal of the teacher it is a matter that is hedged about with statutory restrictions. If a motion for the dismissal of a teacher be brought forward it must be formally communicated by registered post to the teacher, and at the end of three weeks the Board proceed to deliberate upon this notice, and the teacher cannot be dismissed unless he is dismissed by a majority of the full Board.

16275. By their decision is final?—No, their decision is very far from final, because under the 1908 Act he can appeal to the Department within six weeks after his dismissal, and the Department then may make such inquiries as they see fit, and if they think that the dismissal was not reasonably justifiable they can call upon the School Board to reinstate the teacher. Failing reinstatement they may penalise the Board to an extent not exceeding one year's salary of the teacher. The teacher gets this salary. But, of course, they cannot invalidate the School Board's resolution to dismiss. The dismissal takes effect, but they can give that compensation to the teacher.

16276. They can fine the School Board?—They can fine the School Board to an extent not exceeding one year's salary of the teacher.

16277. How do they make their investigation when the appeal comes before them?—The cases are very rare. A chief inspector is charged with the inquiry.

16278. You are sent to investigate?—Yes, the chief inspector is always sent; and then you go over the whole thing and get all the evidence you can, not only connected with the particular case, but connected with the whole history of the relations of the two parties, and you report that to the Department and their decision is final. If they say that they are not to interfere, that simply means that the teacher must go without compensation.

16279. Are there many cases of appeal?—No, not many; very few.

16280. What are they mostly dismissed for?—Generally something affecting character.

16281. Do you also dismiss for inefficiency?—That can be done, but the cases are very rare. I have never had a case where I think inefficiency was alleged to be the cause. It is not easy to demonstrate.

16282. It is mostly cases of character?—Yes.

16283. Are the managers as a rule the local clergy?—The clergy are generally on the Board.

16284. But the managers?—There is a body of three managers—often all laymen.

16285. Mr. HANNAH.—Are the managers generally members of the Board, or do they delegate the office to outsiders?—They sometimes do, especially in the remote district where, say, two managers from the Board may be 30 miles off and the other may be a resident man, not on the Board.

16286. If they got sufficient residents, they would divide the schools among them, and A, B, C would be the managers of one local school, and D, E, F of another?—Yes, in special circumstances.

16287. Mr. HANNAH.—You have no system of increment at present?—No.

16288. Then would you explain to me how your teachers are paid or how their salaries are raised?—The teachers are simply paid by the School Board or managers under their contract. They advertise for a teacher, giving him a certain amount of money, which must be entirely independent of the income of the school in any way. Often in the past, when the teacher's emoluments included a share of the annual grant, the teacher was made to suffer for some external disadvantage, say, an epidemic, and that precarious element has been eliminated years and years ago. He must be paid a definite sum, and then, of course, the School Board raise that money partly out of the rates and partly from the grant.

16289. Will you explain to me how the rise comes?—What rise comes?

16290. The managers advertise for a teacher and get him at a certain salary?—Yes.

16291. Does that salary remain always the same?—Very often managers give an increase of salary, but that is quite indefinite. If it is in the contract that the salary will rise by a certain sum, that is a definite contractual and enforceable arrangement; otherwise it is simply a matter between the teacher and the School Board or managers. The tendency of salaries in Scotland is upward, and pretty so.

16292. Does it not follow from that the scale of salaries in different localities varies very much?—It varies very much indeed.

16293. Mr. KITTLE.—What is the maximum salary of an elementary teacher in Scotland?—A few men receive a salary of £500 or £600 in the larger city schools, but the average salary for certificated head masters is about £180, and for head mistresses £85. Over all the figures for male teachers is £161, and for female teachers £84. I do not see how any man can be expected in a rural district to maintain a wife and family on less than £100 a year, and in the remote parts if our manures were greater, we should be more generous in certain cases.

16294. Mr. HANNAH.—And there is a house and garden besides?—Almost invariably a house (rent and rate free) in the rural parts.

16295. And what would you fix that at?—It depends on the district. In some places the teacher's house would be valued at £10, £15, or £20, as the case may be, in a rural district, but the general tendency with regard to the valuation and the assessing of school buildings is to keep them pretty low.

16296. You are in favour of the teacher's salary being a fixed one—Most decidedly, and utterly independent of the results of inspection.

16297. The CHAIRMAN.—Completely independent of the results of inspection?—Completely independent.

16298. You say that from the inspector's point of view?—As well as from my experience as a manager.

12th July, 1913.]

Mr. J. L. ROBERTSON, LL.D., continued.

[Continued.]

16294. We had a great deal of evidence about reprimands to teachers, and the teachers are up in arms about reprimands being issued by the Board. Do you issue any reprimands in Scotland?—The report goes back to the school after it has passed through the Department, and it must be endorsed in the log book of the school, and the manager will see it there.

16295. Mr. HENDER.—That is not what is meant. In addition to the report going to the school in Ireland there is a special letter sent with it to the manager directing him to go and reprimand the teacher for some particular offence or other, and that reprimand is issued under the authority of a clerk who had no experience of inspection of school work?—But that would never be tolerated with us.

16296. Mr. KAVANAGH.—We have had it in evidence that examiners issue reprimands on their own authority. Could that happen in the Scotch office?—No; the manager's reprimand does not issue from the Scotch office.

16297. I said the examiner?—Oh, never; it would come in the name of the Department. They would write, not to the teacher, but to the managers, to express displeasure or warn seriously that unless there was an amendment in a particular direction a reduction of grant might be insisted.

16298. The complaint was that the examiner issued reprimands without reference at all to the Board?—I am.

16299. Mr. HENDER.—The reprimand is a personal censure on the teacher, and may be spelt altogether from the question of inefficiency.

16300. Mr. KERR.—I gather that the examiner in the Scottish office does issue occasionally letters of warning of the character without consulting any higher authority?—He writes only as an official of the Department, and in its name. It is the desire of the Department to repair the past, and if it is feasible at all they will try to effect that quietly. They might point to some former statement of theirs with regard, for instance, to the condition of a school that was approaching inefficiency, and they would say that a higher standard must be aimed at, and such like.

16301. Would the examiner have authority to issue that without consulting any higher official of the office?—He is a very high official; he is next to the secretary in the office; but almost inevitably in the case of any stringent or drastic action of that kind he would consult with the inspector or chief inspector.

16302. Mr. HENDER.—They would not send a reprimand unless the inspector suggested it?—It would be an extraordinary thing if they passed over the inspector in a matter of that kind. We should think it strange.

16303. Mr. KAVANAGH.—They are the only people that issue the reprimands?—I think there must be cross purposes here. It is only the Department who would issue a warning, as I would call it, rather than a reprimand. The examiner has no personal status or authority apart from the Department.

16304. Mr. KERR.—You were not able to give the relation in amount between the Parliamentary grant and the local aid.—The income per scholar in average attendance at public and voluntary schools from the annual grant, general aid grant, and the fee grant, is as follows:—£1 6s. 8d., 6s. 14d., 12s. 6d. This total income is split for public and voluntary schools.

16305. That is what comes from the Department per head on the average attendance?—Yes. Then from the rates £1 9s. 2d. comes, which is less than the half. Then in voluntary schools only there is a voluntary contribution of 2s. 8½d. per head as against from the rates £1 9s. 2d. per head. These schools get a further aid grant of 8s. You see the national grant alone brings you £1 6s. 8d. from the Department apart from the 6s. 14d. and the 12s. 6d. The fees in the primary schools are paid altogether out of the Imperial Exchequer. The schools are free from all fees in Scotland, that is the elementary schools, if I may use the term. I mean the primary schools. The word "elementary" does not indicate any school in Scotland, etymologically.

16306. Of course, you know that your Parliamentary grant for education in Scotland is considerably larger than ours?—Yes, but I think from what I saw in the papers that you do not provide enough accommodation for your scholars. We have excess of accommodation in Scotland.

16307. But there is a controversy here in this country with regard to what are called the civil rights of teachers, that is whether it is proper that a teacher should have his political liberty restricted. Tell me what your practice in Scotland is?—One of the conditions on which a public grant is paid to any school in Scotland is that the Department must be satisfied that the principal teacher is certificated, and is not allowed to undertake duties not connected with the school which may interfere with the proper performance of his duty as principal teacher.

16308. Might this not work out in practice that the school teacher in Scotland is permitted to sit on a Local Government Board, for instance?—Well, it would depend on whether it interfered with his duty. Certainly if it was within school hours he would not be allowed.

16309. The CHAIRMAN.—If it met in the evening, the teacher might be allowed?—Well, we have cases in the remote West where the teacher, a Board teacher, is one of the most intelligent men on the rural parish Council, and I have never known the question raised with the Department. I know the men who are there, and I do think they are contributing to the real public service of the district in which they live, and without detriment to their professional work.

16310. Would he be free to attend political meetings?—Certainly, but it would be rather undesirable that a public servant should take an active part.

16311. As a matter of fact does the Scotch teacher?—Very rarely. There is a case here and there, but it is very rare.

16312. But he is not prohibited?—No, there is no specific prohibition that I know of. I think it is a case where no definite rule should be laid down, but where we should trust to the man's own discretion and good sense. If there were different sections in the district, he would be really making friends of one section and enemies of another.

16313. The CHAIRMAN.—You know of no instance in which a teacher has been pulled up by a higher official for that?—Not in my own Division; but if a teacher were taking up duties outside that would interfere with the discharge of his duty as a teacher, no doubt he would be.

16314. If he attended a political meeting at from 10 till 12 in the morning?—I dare say he would be, immediately.

16315. Mr. HENDER.—Would it be for attending the meeting or neglecting the school?—I think on the whole that had better be left vague.

16316. You do not find it an acute question with you in Scotland?—I have known men here and there, but very rarely, who acted indifferently and got themselves into trouble.

16317. Have you a bi-lingual programme in Gaelic speaking districts in Scotland?—No formal one, but they use Gaelic when it is necessary. The great feeling among parents even in the remote parts is that the children should learn English as fast as possible.

16318. That is the general feeling?—That is the general feeling. As they say themselves in Gaelic—the children have plenty of Gaelic at home.

16319. Mr. KERR.—I was asking you about the question of elementary education in the Gaelic speaking districts. Would you be kind enough to tell us what is the experience of the Scottish Education Department with regard to the question of bi-lingualism generally?—So far as the Department is concerned they have the fullest freedom to the managers in regard to Gaelic in the general instruction of the schools, pro-

viding that it is used in an educational way. They actually give a grant for the bi-lingual instruction for very junior elementary classes, a special grant, one of the few cases of any special grants. Further, Gaelic is recognised as one of the languages that may be taken in the Intermediate Certificate course, and in Stranor, the town of Lewis, we have sometimes had from 40 to 50 presentations in Gaelic of a fairly high literary standard. There is a professorship of Celtic in Edinburgh University, and there are Lectureships in Celtic in Aberdeen and Glasgow. Students at the Training Colleges at these University centres can attend these Celtic classes, and give a literary finish to their colloquial acquaintance with Gaelic. The Department, so far as the ordinary schools are concerned, leaves the matter, as I said already, to the discretion of the managers. But there does not seem much public enthusiasm in the matter on the part of parents so far as its being taught in the school is concerned. There are many societies that devote a good deal of attention to the preservation of the music and the folk lore of the country, and they are very flourishing indeed.

16810. The old music and folk lore are regarded sympathetically by the Scottish Department of Education?—Distinctly so, though there are no grants paid for it, but the fact of Gaelic being the home language of the people is taken advantage of to have this encouragement by grant given to its use for the acquisition of English. The people are keen to have the children learn English.

16811. I suppose that is on account of the emigration?—I have not the slightest doubt that it is largely from obvious utilitarian motives. The youth are leaving the Gaelic area fast.

16812. The Bannock or Ross.—In the area in Scotland with which you are personally connected the population is sparse?—Very sparse indeed, although geographically it is an extensive area.

16813. The schools you mentioned to us in the course of your evidence were rather large in the number of children attending?—Do you mean in the Island of Lewis?

16814. Yes?—A great many children attend some schools.

16815. And the schools on the mainland?—I could not give the exact size. We have very large schools in a town like Inverness; but in a vast part of the area the schools are very small.

16816. What number would attend these very small schools?—We have small schools of from a dozen children up to 30 and 50, and 60 and 80 in Invernesshire. A large proportion of the schools in that district have below 30 children on the roll. Out of 193 schools in this county, about 130 are below an average roll of 30; in Ross-shire the corresponding number out of 112 schools is about 70.

16817. But with a scattered population like yours it seems to me that you could not get schools of 30 children except at distances of a great many miles apart?—There is a considerable population massed together here and there, but in many districts we have very small schools. In some cases they are come down to such very small numbers that we have a special provision in the code to meet cases of that kind. That is called article 190 (a) of the code. In thinly peopled districts where the number of scholars that can be brought together at one centre is less than 15, or where it can be proved to the satisfaction of the inspector that any slight excess over this number is not likely to be permanent, children under 10 years of age who live two miles, and children over 10 years of age who live more than three miles from any aided school by the nearest road, or separated from it by the sea, may be instructed at their own homes or elsewhere by a teacher approved by the inspector; and if these scholars meet for 100 days in the year the Department will pay half the salary of the teacher. These are what are called in general sub-schools. So a remote shepherd or gamekeeper with a family of five or six children has provision made for his case, and any boy or girl about 15 years or more, if approved by the inspector, may go

there for 100 days in the year and the Department will pay half the salary. The mere fact that that is in the code indicates how sparsely distributed the population of Scotland is in parts.

16818. I suppose if you found yourself at one of your schools in one of your districts you might have a great many miles to travel before you found another of your schools?—Yes.

16819. What would be the longest distance you would have to travel to get from school to school?—Not very long, if you take into account the sub-schools under this provision. In cases 10 or 12 miles; in a few very much longer.

16820. What remuneration do the sub-schools get?—They are paid £10 or £15 up to £20; and there are cases where they get £30. It is but a trifle, but it is better than nothing. The teachers frequently change; a young lad or lass of 16 or 17 soon grows up and wants to go off somewhere else. The County Committee allow their bursaries to be held from such a minor school, and I will show later how our bursaries are distributed all over the county and what classes of the population get them.

16821. The CHAIRMAN.—I understood you to say that the attendance must be 100 days—100 days in the year by the latest code. We try if possible where the population is stationary and likely to increase to induce the managers to put up a permanent school. The Department would be content with a composite building of wood and iron, a type of building coming into great use in many parts of the country for domestic economy classes and other.

16822. The Bannock or Ross.—If you had 30 scholars that could be counted on, would you put up a permanent school?—Yes; the feeling is that equitably the disadvantages of remoteness must be minimised in these cases as much as possible, at the expense of the general tax payer.

16823. What would be the salary of a certificated teacher?—In such a school about £50 to £70 in the Highlands.

16824. Mr. HENRY.—Is that for a man?—That is for a woman teacher. Men, as a rule, would not apply for such a post.

16825. The Bannock or Ross.—Would there be any other emolument besides the salary?—A little house.

16826. But nothing like capitation fees?—No fees are paid except in the secondary school, and that rarely.

16827. So £70 would cover the entire cost of such a school?—Yes, and it would probably rise to £80 if the school grew. If a teacher gets on well with the people, there are many ways in which they show their respect to him. This is a very marked feature of Scotch rural education, that is that the people are exceedingly good to the teacher.

16828. Mr. COOPER.—There is one question that I would be glad to have your well-informed view on, that is the question of passes on the individual examination of pupils. Do you not think that there is some advantage in examining pupils, putting the question of payment out of consideration?—Yes. Do not for a moment think that though the payment on individual passes has ceased the individual examination of children has ceased. In fact this qualifying examination that you see here (Art. 29) is largely individual, and our inspectors set a written test and discuss with the teacher any defects, and often report specially on them.

16829. Mr. HENRY.—What is the strength of your inspection staff in Scotland?—I think we are 68 all told. There are 5 chief inspectors, 23 full inspectors, 8 junior inspectors, 8 sub-inspectors of the first class, 31 of the second class, and we have 3 lady inspectors for domestic subjects, needlework, cookery, laundry, making a total of 63. You may call that the outdoor staff, so to speak.

16830. And what is the average attendance in the schools?—For all Scotland the actual average attendance in 1912 on which grant was claimed was 738,000.

16331. So that you have 50 per cent. in attendance more than we have in this country. We have about 500,000 and you have over 750,000, and you have 68 inspectors, while we have 267?—Yes.

16332. And a large portion of your country is similar to Ireland in having a sparse population?—Yes.

16333. How often do your inspectors visit the schools in the year?—A good number of them twice, the more remote ones probably about once in the year, sometimes twice. When one of our men is moving about he covers a good deal of ground in the remote parts before he comes home.

16334. How often is he bound to visit?—He is supposed to visit, I won't say he is quite bound. I think the Department gives us a great discretion provided we do the best we can for our districts. But as a rule we visit about twice a year.

16335. You have told us that every school has its own scheme of work?—Yes.

16336. Would you please explain what that means?—Well, as a rule they are practically the same in so far as what you call the fundamentals are concerned, reading, writing, and arithmetic. There is no great divergence of method or content there; but we go much beyond the ordinary constituents of the elementary curriculum. In the inland parts, for instance, a great many have practical instruction in gardening and agriculture, and along the coast perhaps in navigation instead of gardening. Some extraordinary secondary work is done in a lot of primary schools.

16337. They vary according to the needs of the district?—Yes.

16338. That is you leave to the teacher freedom to draft a scheme of work suitable to the locality or the needs of the pupils?—Yes, outside general essentials.

16339. In other words, you do not impose one uniform scheme on the whole country?—Quite the contrary.

16340. Now, in this country we have I think 13 subjects which are made compulsory on all the schools. The subjects are English, including the several kinds of reading and spelling, written composition and grammar, geography, history, arithmetic, singing, drawing, needlework for girls, physical drill, manual instruction, object lessons in elementary science, cookery for girls, laundry work for girls, kindergarten for infants. Have you any regulation imposing subjects as numerous as those on all schools?—Our code prescribes generally most of these. Manual instruction, science, cookery and laundry are optional and specially paid for. Before 1899 we had a list of 13 specific subjects, voluntary, I should say, but since then definite prescriptions in such subjects has ceased. As a matter of fact we find a marked uniformity throughout the whole country with regard to what you may call fundamental subjects; but we do not strictly impose the amount or the methods in any subject. We discuss or confer with teachers if they think a particular subject should be dropped or insisted; but we have very little difficulty with regard to those schemes. I am speaking of auxiliary subjects, not the essential. In fact what we have to repress a little, I may say, is the tendency to excess and multiplexion.

16341. Then do you propose in addition the system of organization that must be adopted in the school?—Not expressly so; we simply have a regulation to see that the organization and classification within the divisions (Infants, Junior, and Senior) of the school are satisfactory.

16342. But you do not impose any system?—Not expressly. If we find a school is badly organized we consult with the teacher and try to improve things, so that the matter of organization falls into lines that are pretty well accredited.

16343. In fact, if I understand you aright, in your dealing with teachers both in regard to their programme and the organization of the schools your principle is to give them as large an amount of freedom as possible?—Yes.

16344. Do you interfere with their methods of teach-

ing?—Well, not except in the way of discussing or suggesting, if a method is not a satisfactory one. The same goal can be reached probably by different methods, though there may be no really marked difference between methods in education which produce uniformly good results. We should certainly criticize any method that we thought was not applicable to the teaching of the subject. But we do not lay down any hard and fast rule.

16345. Then if you found the teacher doing good work in what we might call a recognized method, you would not interfere with him?—Not at all.

16346. Do you think that it is desirable that the teacher should be interfered with?—I think the inspector has more experience of varied school work, and I think it is his duty, on the principle that they are, as it were, co-workers, the teacher and himself, to communicate his knowledge and discuss the matter.

16347. But supposing, to make a concrete case, that you found the teacher explaining the rule for carrying in subtraction and that he adopted decomposition, would you think it right to insist that he must adopt the method of equal additions?—No, because we know that the matter may be as done and approved in other parts of the country. We leave a good deal of discretion to the teacher in the matter of method. There is not much divergence in the more technical methods.

16348. If a man was to take the number 327 and say that it was made up of three hundreds, two tens, and seven units, would you condemn him for that?—Certainly not.

16349. He has been known to be condemned for that in this country?—For what?

16350. For calling the seven, units?—What else was he to call them?

16351. Seven one's. Would you think that an improvement?—Well, I do not see it; but it is pleasing that such a serious matter as inspection is varied by a little amusement. Was it a case in which there was any disparaging remark by the inspector?

16352. Not only that, but he noted in the observation book that the term "unit" was not to be used. You have nothing like that in Scotland, I think?—Well, I never heard of it.

16353. Now you told us that it is a principle with you that the inspector is left long enough in the district to know the schools and the teachers?—Yes, that is the general rule, and some are left many years.

16354. We had an arrangement introduced into this country in 1909 by which three inspectors were put into what was called a circuit, and that circuit was divided into three sections, A, B, and C, and one inspector took section A this year, B next year, and C next year; so that there was a rotation of the three inspectors in the three sections of the circuit in three years. What would you think of that arrangement?—I would not consider it in any sense objectionable, provided they were doing the work on a common principle, and a common method, and had frequent opportunities of communication. If it meant that there would be anything of a radical change in the methods of inspection, I think it would be hard on the teaching staff, and certainly detrimental to orderly education.

16355. How could the inspectors under this arrangement know the schools and teachers?—Well, they certainly had very little opportunity, unless you had that safeguard that they had frequent inter-communication, and general agreement as to educational policy and methods.

16356. In your system in Scotland when you place an inspector in a district is he the only person held responsible for the education of that district?—Of course, the chief inspector shares the responsibility with him.

16357. How many schools would the chief inspector have under him?—It depends on the district. I have very few in my Division, because it is so sparsely peopled. We do not require such a big staff. The other Divisions—Northern, Southern and Western—have large staffs. Take the case of the Southern.

16358. How many would there be there altogether?—

There are 15 in that chief inspector's division. There are 6 of these who are inspectors in charge of districts within the division, which are evidently what you call circuits here. Those inspectors have been there for a considerable number of years, several years at any rate.

16350. What is the duty of the chief there with regard to these inspectors under him?—Well, in regard to ordinary primary inspection I do not think he takes much to do with them, but if any abnormal difficulty arose, the question would be referred to him by the Department, and he would likely consult the inspector. Another thing is this, that the chief inspectors in each division summon their staff occasionally to what is called a divisional conference, a sort of round-table non-committal conference, and have a free interchange of views on the policy and method of inspection, or anything affecting the efficiency of the district work. It is quite common with us, so that you may say every division is an educational unit where there is a considerable accord and practically no material absence of accord.

16351. Have you had experience in Scotland of a marked diversity of standard adopted by inspectors?—In the old days there was a considerable and regrettable amount of that here and there, but nowadays there is practically very little, because there is a good working understanding, fostered, not a little, by the system of divisional conference, where, as I have explained, the chief inspector summons the staff and confers with them and communicates to them any permissible communications from the meetings of the chief inspectors with the secretary. Of course, as I told you already, the secretary frequently calls the five chief inspectors together in conference. So in that way any marked change or any proposed innovation of which public notice is given is thoroughly understood by the staff beforehand, both as to general bearing and practical application throughout the whole country.

16352. Have you had any experience that when there was a change of policy in the Department there was a marked fall in the character of the reports?—I think in the old days of rigid individual inspection and payment by result there was little of that. It did not occur to any very large extent, but speaking from recollection I say there were undoubtedly clear cases. I hardly ever hear anything of that kind at all now.

16353. In other words, I think you stated that the teacher is really to some extent a co-worker with the inspector?—I mean to say that that is the underlying idea of the whole present day system.

16354. Then when inspection takes place, with, of course, some examination of the children, does the teacher take part in that examination?—He might be asked to do so, especially if things were not going very well. It is a very common thing, at least it used to be in my own work, to say: "Now just take your own way and let us see how you get on," because a man may have a different way and it will give him an opportunity if he can to redress, as it were, the poor appearance of a class.

16355. Now, you must have had in Scotland, as we have had, some cases of old teachers who have found it difficult to satisfy the modern requirements. Kindly tell us if you please what is your mode of dealing with old teachers?—I think that our general tendency has been to deal very generously with them, because we always thought it equitable that men who had worked well in the old days with the ideas and materials at their disposal should be very gently laid down. In addition to that we have a system in which vacation classes are held under the auspices of the Provincial Committees. These are the Committees that have to do with the respective training colleges at the centres, and the County Committees often contribute to the teacher's expense in attending these classes for his further instruction. They are generally held in the month of August. Thus, a teacher, belated in the race, as it were, may get up a working knowledge of a particular subject, for instance, school gardening, and a great number of older teachers take to this recent system very kindly, and have a month's special training in some extra subject suitable to the school area. This has been a very successful movement indeed.

16356. You endeavour as far as possible that the teachers shall not be dismissed for efficiency?—We would not regard it as an essential point in a charge of inefficiency that a man could not teach what he was never instructed to teach.

16357. Or what he was not employed to teach?—Of course, that is a difference also.

16358. Have you had any cases of teachers who have been dismissed for inefficiency?—There have been such cases, but they are very, very rare, especially in recent years. A good many of the old school have gone on the superannuation list, and the modern teacher has been trained or is well up in nearly all the subjects required or expected in the ordinary school.

16359. But teachers, although they may be well up on subjects, may not all be efficient teachers?—No, certainly not. Attainment and teaching capacity may be quite detached.

16360. Well, in the case of an adverse report from the inspector, I understood you to say that an appeal is open to the teacher?—Yes, it is open to the teacher through the managers to appeal against the report of the Department, and the Department would make inquiry; but it is very rare.

16361. But the appeal is there as a matter of right?—I do not think it is explicitly stated in that way in the code, but it is simply the right of the man to make a representation; in other words, the Department is accessible to all complaints on the part of managers, teachers or parents. Parents very frequently write up to the Department, especially from the districts of those small sub-schools. A shepherd may write up to say that he has 6 or 7 of a family, and he cannot get education for them. The Department send this down to the inspector, and at the same time communicate with the local School Board. We look upon the Department as being quite accessible, but in any case of that kind the parents as a rule in Scotland write to the local member of Parliament also.

16362. In the case of a special report from an inspector, an adverse report, would you please tell us what is done in the first instance?—In the first instance the report is communicated to the School Board, and then if the School Board or teacher think it was an unfair report, they simply communicate their objection to the Department. If the grant be withheld, a special and strict procedure is enforced. The Department instruct the chief inspector, who would, of course, communicate with the district inspector who had written the report. The Department might remit the grant or impose any reduction of grant after full consideration. Serious defaults on the part of the teacher or negligence on the part of the managers may entail deductions of grant; but we usually lenge these with reasonable evidence or promise of improvement.

16363. Might there be such a thing as a report from an inspector recommending that a certain member of the staff should be dismissed?—Dismissed, do you mean?

16364. Dismissed?—I do not think it would be a prudent type of language for any official to write. He might simply report the facts, because dismissal does not rest with him. Of course, a continuation of reports certifying responsibly the inefficiency of any teacher would I think justify any Board in getting rid of him.

16365. But what is the routine that would be followed?—The routine would be that the Department would in the first place send the report to the School Board, who would send it to the teacher for entry in his log book. If they had any objection to it they could state it to the Department; but there is no specific provision for that.

16366. But supposing that the chief inspector went down to find out whether that report was justified or not, what steps would he take and what is the mode of procedure?—Well, assuming a report of such a character, I would immediately get my colleagues with me and we would go over the points, looking to the previous history of the school and the particular teacher in regard to reports, and then I might set such tests as I

thought necessary. I have been 33 years on the staff and I never had a case of that kind.

16376. What amount of floor space do you require for each pupil?—It varies. In administering the relative article of the code the accommodation in the case of new schools will be calculated in accordance with the Department's rules of 1906; in the case of existing schools the Department will accept for the present the accommodation hitherto recognised, subject to the fulfilment of the general requirements of this article, provided that the number of children habitually in attendance in one room does not exceed for any portion of the year the number for which by official sanction provides accommodation. It does not state the exact number, but it refers to the rules of 1906. Rule 16 is that the accommodation of schools is based on the number of children that may be seated at desks ranged in accordance with rule 15, provided that a minimum of 10 square feet of floor space per child is obtained. That is what you want?

16377. Yes?—While this represents the minimum amount of floor space that can be recognised as sufficient, it is desirable that a larger area should always be provided wherever practicable. At meetings of school medical officers in Edinburgh recently I noticed a consensus of opinion that the whole question of school building and equipment badly needed overhauling. Inadequacies in design, facility of much of the expensive ventilation provision, over-crowding, and the want of facilities for physical exercises were parts of the general complaint. The doctor has now a place in the schools in Scotland, and the corporals cannot loudly claim its importance in the educational sphere.

16378. The CHAIRMAN.—Two things have struck me in your evidence. One is the freedom that breathes through your whole system, and the second is this wonderful diagram which you have given showing the provision you have made for the poor boy working his way upwards. You have the primary school and the intermediate school and the secondary school, all leading up to that examination. Now, by what method have you co-ordinated these three systems, so that pupils from the three are able to pass that common examination?—I will try to explain to you what it all means.

16379. How is it that pupils from the primary, the intermediate school, and the secondary school, representing these three systems, are so co-ordinated that pupils going from the three of them pass that common examination?—The inherent justification for this common qualifying examination is that it is an examination in the fundamentals of education as laid down in article 21 (read article). We say that this is the irreducible minimum of elementary education that any boy or girl should have before starting on any special instruction—practical, technical, or secondary.

16380. You take only subjects for that examination that would be common to the three schools?—Yes, and in this examination particularly, the teacher's estimate of the attainments of each of the boys he presents we attach great importance to. We encourage him to put them all forward, not to select them, but to put forward the whole class at the top of the school. This tends to react favourably on the whole of the school work, and we hold an examination, and we may find that a boy that was marked high only got 80 or 90 on examination. Let me explain the method and its educational motive at some length, premising that with slight, but no basal changes, the same apply in the examination procedure in the case of secondary schools and the training centres for teachers. The one that knows best the capacity of a pupil or student is his regular teacher. The hazard of a single day's written examination on the work of a year should not be decisive. Such test should be in essence and intention merely a control of the teacher's considered and responsible verdict, based on the frequent and conventional oral and written tests of the pupil's studies and progress throughout the session. If the teacher's scheduled estimate (usually expressed numerically on a maximum of 100) is in substantial accord with the result of the formal external written examination, and

particularly with the teacher's graded estimate of attainment in a list of the whole presentation in any one subject, his estimate has been justified and corroborated and is accepted. If one or more in such a list break away and be much below the "written" result, the case is specially investigated by the inspector at the school, and on the presumption that the teacher's estimate is the reliable one. If satisfactory evidence from immediate oral or written trial by the inspector, backed by the term records of the session's class examinations, be forthcoming the failure in the culminating written examination does not count against the pupil. Of course, the teacher's estimate, if absolutely and relatively in marked divergence must be rejected and the result of the written examination must stand. The graded approximation over a school course of years to acceptable harmony between the internal and external estimates is surprising, and vindicates the tempering and modification of the old rigid, one might almost say, mandarin system of school examination.

16381. Mr. HANLY.—Now, after these boys have passed that qualifying examination do you render any assistance to the poorer members among them to proceed to intermediate education?—Probably there is nothing that Scotland feels prouder of than that, that from the lowest school in the land a clever boy may get encouragement to rise to the very highest place in the secondary school. In recent years, after the decision of when we tell the County Education Committee, Government funds have been placed at their disposal by means of which these committees have bursaries for clever boys which we give preferentially to those needing assistance. Those who can easily reach the secondary schools we as a rule disregard, but those in remote districts who have not such opportunities we try to compensate by giving bursaries. I am Chairman of the County Committee of Inverness, and I can give you a list of the occupations of parents or guardians of such boys or girls. Last year we gave 180 bursaries. We have a great number from Baine, South Uist, and the rest of the Hebrides. Out of the 185, 19 were the children of widows, and 35 the children of crofters. A crofter is a small holder under 430. To give you an indication of the social class that we reach by our bursary system, I may tell you that we have children of widows, coopers, shoe-makers, fishermen, gillies, game-keepers, masons, shepherds, farm servants, rural postmen, labourers, quarry men, tailors, millers, rural station masters, keepers of temperance hotels or lodging houses, small rural merchants, brewery workers, engine drivers, army pensioners, gardeners, ship masters, professional men, fletchers (that is Scotch for butchers), plumbers, railway agents, travellers, literary workers, farmers, grocers, printers, balcers, plasterers, landrimmers, and very occasionally of rural druggymen. Now I should say that that is an indication of how the talented poor are looked to in our distribution of bursaries.

16382. You are not afraid that you may divert those people from their natural pursuits?—We do not believe in any doctrine of pre-destination in these things at all. We believe that the Scotch boy has the world before him in any school.

16383. Are those bursaries sufficient to enable them to get a continual course in the intermediate school?—With those bursaries of £15 or £20 he works through the intermediate certificate, but the sum is in too many cases hardly adequate. If he wants to become a teacher he becomes a junior student, or further on goes to the University. We have boys from the remote Hebrides that are now in excellent positions gained by their secondary education. One Gaelic speaking boy that I remember very well as a little boy in a remote school is now the head teacher of English in one of the largest towns in Scotland. A fair number enter the Church, and medicine and teaching claim a great number. With several that come from the Highlands teaching is very popular, and when they go back they know the surroundings of the people, and get on well.

16384. So that by that means you have provided machinery by which a boy can go to the University and to a profession?—Yes.

16385. Now, with regard to the training centre course, you say it continues for one, two, three, or four years?—Yes.

16386. Taking the Scotch teachers in general, how long is their training course?—Our full primary course is two years, but we have a number of untrained teachers, a sort of heritage from the old days, and we try to get them to improve themselves by a year's training at the Centre.

16387. That is one year's course?—Yes, and we also arrange practical courses for those who have gone right through the University and want to teach a higher subject as specialists.

16388. Have those who go for one year's course to occupy their positions as teachers?—Yes.

16389. We had a system like that where a teacher would go for one year's training, but he was bound to appoint a substitute?—We in the North are rather against the appointment of substitutes, because we found that they were not as a rule satisfactory.

16390. The Chairman.—Does that teacher who goes in for a year get housed and lodged at the expense of the system?—He may get an allowance from the Provincial Committee, a very small amount. In fact, he has to make a very considerable sacrifice. There are a number of teachers who are untrained, but who, having a natural aptitude for teaching, teach very well indeed.

16391. Mr. HENRY.—What proportion of the teachers would go up for a three or four years' course?—Well, that is meant primarily for those who concurrently take the University course. They are working through for their degree, and taking their training course at the same time or immediately after.

16392. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—In the Irish schools there is what is called an observation book, in which the inspector makes his observations at the end of a visit. Have you such a book in your system?—No, we have no observation book, but we have the school log book.

16393. And when the report that has been sent up to the Department has been sent to the school it is copied into that?—Yes, we have that regulation.

16394. Now, with regard to the inspection of schools, do you say a sub-inspector of the second class might inspect a school?—Yes.

16395. When he writes his report he sends it to the chief inspector?—He sends it to the inspector under whom he works, the inspector of the district. If he works with me he sends it to me, because besides being chief inspector I have also an inspection district of my own. None of the other chief inspectors have, but I do happen, in my case.

16396. You occupy a double position?—In that way, yes. I have a district and I am also chief inspector of the Highland Division.

16397. Then he would send the report to the district inspector?—He would send it to me, if he were a sub-inspector working with me.

16398. And that district inspector, with the exception of yourself, would be a full inspector, I suppose?—Yes; in Scotland they are called His Majesty's Inspectors of Schools. The inspector is appointed by His Majesty in Council, and that is why "H.M." is put before our official address.

16399. And the district inspector would consider the report and forward it on to the Department?—Yes.

16400. Would he make notes upon it?—He may; he counter-signs or initials it. I very frequently have a talk with the sub-inspector that I have to deal with, more for getting additional information than on account of any change in the report. We discuss matters freely.

16401. Then when it goes into the Department it is referred to the examiner?—Yes.

16402. If the examiner considers that any action should be taken upon it the Department would refer it again to the district inspector, or would they refer it to the sub-inspector?—They would refer it to the dis-

trict inspector only, because he is responsible for the report.

16403. He receives the report from the sub-inspector?—Yes.

16404. And when he considers that report, will he forward it on for such comments or additions as he considers it necessary for the Department to have?—Yes.

16405. And then when the district inspector receives it he would confer with the sub-inspector and return an answer to the Department on the subject?—Yes.

16406. You understand the system of National Education in Ireland, under which an inspector's report may have very serious consequences for the teacher. The salaries of the teachers are provided from public funds, and are transmitted to the teachers by the National Board—transmitted through the managers, but the managers in this case are but channels of communication—and there is no local authority between the teachers and the National Board, and there is an elaborate system of merit marks, "excellent," "very good," "good," "fair," "satisfactory," and "bad," and it depends on the number of "excellent's," "very good's," or "good's" that a man receives whether the increment of his salary is awarded to him or not. In that case, of course, the relations between the visiting inspector and the teacher are very different from those which you have in Scotland, where your opinion as to the results of a visit would have no such consequences for him. I understand that the very worst that could happen with regard to an adverse opinion of a visiting inspector supported by the Department would be that a small proportion of the grant would be deducted, and that that would be deducted from the local authority and not from the teacher?—Not from the teacher.

16407. And the teacher would suffer nothing really by that adverse report, necessarily, immediately?—Not immediately, not pecuniarily.

16408. Of course, if the inspector were always reporting adversely on a school, serious consequences might follow to the teacher, but they do not follow necessarily as the outcome of the inspector's report?—That is so.

16409. Are there many school teachers who become inspectors?—Practically all the old inspectors have had experience of teaching, and a large number of sub-inspectors of the second class have had a somewhat prolonged experience in teaching. All our staff of chief inspectors have had years of experience in teaching.

16410. The Chairman.—Is that the only experience required?—It is not the sole requirement, but I think it is a natural one, and I think it is looked to in the first selection.

16411. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—The inspectorship is looked upon as in the ordinary course of promotion for the teacher?—Not so, I should say. At the present moment our Department are, I understand, considering a scheme under which teachers of standing and of well proved competence and administrative ability, who are, say, a little older than the age at which inspectors are now appointed, would have a chance of a post as inspector.

16412. The Chairman.—Is that for intermediate schools?—For any class of school, I understand. We do not put any school into a compartment and call it exclusively a primary school, and so on. Our staff is prepared to work in any section of the educational field in Scotland.

16413. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—When a teacher is dismissed in Scotland for some incidental fault, not for inefficiency, but when it is desirable for discipline that he should be dismissed, has he a chance of being employed in Scotland again?—Yes, at the risk of the Board or managers, if his certificate be not cancelled.

16414. And the Department do not look upon that teacher as no longer to be recognized as a teacher?—They have a system under which, where a teacher is dismissed for any grave fault, especially of moral character, of asking the next School Board who employ him whether they are aware of the circumstances under which he left the other place.

16th July, 1913.]

MR. J. L. ROBERTSON, LL.D., continued.

[Continued.]

16418. But they do not put a veto upon him?—Unless it is more serious. It would be most serious before they would cancel his certificate. They are very rare cases, but there must be such cases in all professions.

16419. You spoke about the desks for all the scholars. There has been a great complaint made that in Irish schools there are not sufficient desks for all the scholars. Would you say that every scholar in the school should have a desk?—From what I have heard of medical opinion recently I am inclined to think that it would be well that inspectors in their recommendations with regard to desks in schools should be in accord with considered medical opinion. We have in Scotland a system of medical inspection of scholars, and as I said before the doctor is beginning to look round things of that kind. He inquires also into physical defects of the children, and also gives us advice on sanitation and general school hygiene. But at the same time I find a good deal of variety of opinion among doctors themselves on these points.

16420. But every child above a certain age, a very low age, must during each day be allowed some time to sit at a desk. They have a system by which some of the children are marched out of the desks and some marched in, and that would be rather in accord with the doctors' recommendation?—I think something of that kind. When the subject of physical exercises is developed more that may be looked upon as not a thing to be condemned.

16421. Have you anything to say with regard to the position of the kindergarten system in Scotland?—Yes, that is a highly appreciated and recognised method of infant training.

16422. Now, would the children in those cases sit at desks?—It would depend upon the style of kindergarten work we were getting. Any kindergarten work that involved manual work, like our paper-folding and all that, could hardly be done without desks or tables.

16423. Or something in the nature of desks?—Yes; I hear that in some places they are contemplating collapsible desks that can be moved to the side. What I think opinion will ultimately tend to is having more room for movement. Young children are by nature gregarious and active, and cribbling and cowering them in a desk all day long is supposed by doctors to affect the spine slightly.

16424. Mr. HENRY.—The system that we had in this country up to recently was this, that we had desks in the major portion of our schools for half the pupils, and the other half were working in drafts in circles round the room, and at the termination of half-an-hour those who were in the desks went to the draft, and those who were in the drafts went to the desks, and thus the pupils had to change position every half hour?—I think you have anticipated some probable medical advice and suggestion in that way.

16425. That is not exactly the system which is adopted in this country at present?—What else?

16426. They want to have all the pupils seated?—Well, my own opinion is that one should go slowly in face of this new system of school medical treatment, with regard to recommendations as to desks, etc., and carry with one the matured concurrence of the medical men.

16427. My own experience as a teacher was this, that we got better work out of the pupils when we had that change of position, and that by means of that the pupils were in a better position for working than in the desks?—What did they do in those circles in the room, was it reading, with the teacher in the chair?

16428. Well, I think the teacher did not sit. Reading was one thing that they were taught, and then we had them at grammar lessons?—That used to be the way in the old school. A good many of what are supposed to be new things are simply a reversion to older systems.

16429. Then we had arithmetic at that time, and, of course, we had arithmetic in the desks too, and then history lessons and various things of that kind?—Yes.

16430. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—At one period in the history of education the gallery was introduced?—Yes.

16431. I don't know how you do in Scotland in that matter?—In Scotland some Boards have waged war on the galleries for some time, and they are disappearing. I would not be much surprised if I found them coming back. Things are in a state of flux with regard to equipment of school rooms and ventilation, and particularly lighting. I was very much struck lately with a criticism by a school medical expert on the usual methods of ventilation. A lot of expensive apparatus that we have in the schools for ventilation is condemned now. The high-ceilinged room is condemned, and it is said that 12 feet should be the height of the ceiling, and that there should be preferably the simple natural ventilation from cross windows.

16432. The higher you make the room the more foul gas you get into it?—It has been ascertained by experiments in Shropshire that that is the effect of a high ceiling, that when the children are in an apparently well-ventilated room they are sitting in a vitiated atmosphere.

16433. I may mention an experience in the East, where the punkah is used. I have had to make it a rule in some places that I have been in that the punkah should be not to work for a short time before the company sat down to dinner, otherwise during the first five minutes of the punkah if they sat down they were breathing the distinctly vitiated atmosphere that had accumulated above, between the high ceiling and the tops of the windows. Have you any system of kindergarten work prescribed in Scotland?—No prescribed system; the teacher is allowed full play there again. We all work for the same common object, for the development of the intelligence of the child.

16434. And in the training colleges the kindergarten work receives attention?—Receives great attention.

THIRTY-SIXTH DAY.—WEDNESDAY, 16TH JULY, 1913.

At 23, Kildare street, Dublin.

PRESENT:—**SIR SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman);** The Most Rev. **DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross; SIR HIRAM SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; MR. JOHN COFFEY; MR. HENRAGE E. B. HARRISON, B.A.; MR. JEREMIAH HENLY; MR. WALTER MCMURROUGH KAVANAGH, B.A.; MR. THOMAS MICHAEL KETTLE, B.A.; and**

MR. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

MR. THOMAS R. MCMURROUGH, B.A., Principal of Hidden National School, Lisburn, examined.

18481. The CHAIRMAN.—How long have you been in the service of the National Board of Education?—For over 30 years.

18482. And you are now first of first grade?—Yes.

18483. And how long have you been that?—Since the 1st of April, 1906.

18484. You say you have been principal teacher for over 30 years. You were principal of Nicholas Memorial School, Lisburn, from the 1st of August, 1889, to the 30th of April, 1910?—That is so, sir.

18485. Now, I observe in a letter which you yourself wrote* (it is published by the Inspector, by the way) in 1910, that you refer to dismissal from that school?—That is so, sir.

18486. As it is published I suppose you do not object to tell us the occasion of it?—Oh, not at all, and in fact I think I would wish to explain it.

18487. I assumed that you would?—Yes, if you please.

18488. That was before you went to Upper Falls school I suppose?—Yes.

18489. And what was the cause of your dismissal from the Nicholas Memorial School?—There came a new manager for the school some years previously. There had come a new manager for the school, and he had views of his own with regard to extraneous duties by teachers and the staff of the school.

18490. Is this connected with any Church?—This school is under the Educational Endowments Commissioners. A new assistant teacher was appointed to the school, and she was appointed by the governors of the schools without any condition whatsoever about Sunday duty, but the manager insisted that she should come down every Sunday from Belfast. The train service was very inconvenient, and the result was that this young lady had to leave Belfast on Sunday morning at half-past eight, and it so happened that after the Sunday morning service there was no train home till half-past four on the Sunday afternoon, and she did not get home until after five o'clock; so that on Sunday she had a longer day's work than on any other day.

18491. And the manager kept her at work on the day that the school was not at work?—Yes, I happened to notice this young lady once on a severe windy Sunday in the streets of Lisburn, and I privately directed the attention of some of the governors to this matter. They said to me that I should tell this young lady that it was no part of her duty to come down on Sunday. However, I wanted to avoid trouble with the manager, of course, and I said that I would prefer that it should be mentioned by the Governors themselves. So this lady was told by some of the governors that it was no part of her duty to come to the Church on Sunday, seeing that she lived in Belfast. The first month after she ceased teaching in the Sunday School and attending the Church on Sunday she received three months' notice from the manager; but, of course, the manager had not the power to give her three months' notice, for that was for the governors. I got a copy of the three months' notice from the assistant and I said: "Let the matter rest at that and make no fuss about it"; and the matter was not mentioned at that time, and the notice simply lapsed. That was the first notice to the assistant teacher. Some time after that there was an inquiry about the placing of assistants, the first, second, and third assistant of schools, and so forth, and a circular, I understand, was sent to each manager asking the manager to place the assistants

definitely in the order in which they should be in the school. This lady happened to be first assistant, and the manager said he would now make her second assistant, the result of which would have been, of course, that she was to lose her stipend. I was only the principal of the school, but in the making out of the quarterly returns I felt that this would be very unjust, and I said to the manager that I could not consent to, to return Miss Flood as second assistant in the school, and I made out the quarterly return as usual with Miss Flood as first assistant, and left it to the manager in this way: "Do you think it would be right? Of course, this is a matter for the governors and you cannot do it, but if you insist on doing it, I think at least the matter ought to be inquired into." A day or two after that he said to me: "You need not trouble about the matter any further; just let her remain first assistant, where she is, in the school, but I have made up my mind that she will be dismissed definitely," and a few weeks after I got a private letter from the manager asking me to look out for another school. Of course, I did not do so, because I felt that I should not be called upon to resign on grounds like that; and the situation became pretty strained. Then on the 1st of April the manager gave this young lady teacher and myself three months' notice of dismissal, and I should say that he had not the consent or sympathy of a single governor in connection with the school. There were six governors, and all of the governors were very much opposed to the action that had been taken by Mr. Greer.

18492. That was Mr. Under Greer?—The Rev. Under Greer. In the result, both notions of dismissal had to be withdrawn; the notions were entirely *ad hoc* ones, and had to be withdrawn, and then this vacancy in Upper Falls arose, and it was suggested to me by some of my friends, seeing that relations were not as they had been formerly between me and the manager, and as the place was so near home, and the manager of Upper Falls happened to know the whole circumstances, that it might be well for me to accept it; and it was quite as good a school as the Nicholas Memorial. There could be no loss of money by going there, but in point of fact I gained by going there, because the school in which I am now is close to this one, and I was only eight months in Upper Falls.

18493. Am I right in gathering that you were not actually dismissed in the end?—I got another appointment. I was not dismissed; the dismissals were withdrawn, and a new agreement had to be entered into with every teacher in the school.

18494. You said you had received notice of dismissal. Not that you were dismissed?—I would like to say that when that letter was written to Mr. Keils it never was intended for publication, otherwise I would not have used the expression "On All Fools' Day."

18495. But you were not actually dismissed?—No; but of course I used that expression "On All Fools' Day" in the letter to Mr. Keils.

18496. I wish you would concentrate your attention first on your own case with reference to the remarks of the inspectors that were published by the National Board. You know what I refer to?—Yes.

18497. That was at your deposition, and we have it before us here?—Would I not be entitled to submit my own case, which I consider was very hard, seeing that my increment and promotion were stopped?

18498. Suppose you begin in the first place with what you regard as the important part of your own case, and then we will come to the inspector?—Very well.

16440. Mr. CARRY.—There is one word in the first line of your proofs that I do not quite understand. Are you first of first grade, or first of first class?—I am first of first grade only. I am not first of first class.

16450. Then as first of first grade, what claim would you have for an increment?—There are three increments in the first of first grade.

16451. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, I wish you would state your own case with regard to increment?—Well, the triennial period, as I have stated, dates from the 1st of April, 1906, to the 31st of March, 1909.

16452. Now with regard to the reports, what were the reports received within that triennial period?—“Excellent” from Mr. Keith on the 6th of September, 1906, “good” from Mr. Keith on the 26th of October, 1907, “good” from Mr. Kelly on the 6th of December, 1908.

16453. How many years was Mr. Keith in your district?—His first year was 1906, and he was there until I left the school in May, 1910.

16454. When he gave you “good” in 1907 what was the reason of that drop?—The inspection of 4th September, 1906, was an inspection, not a formal inspection.

16455. An incidental inspection?—Oh, no; it was an inspection for general report; but I may tell you it was carried out in accordance with the regulations as they now exist. Mr. Keith walked into the school and went round and saw what was going on, and expressed himself generally very highly pleased.

16456. And in October, 1907, it was a formal inspection?—Entirely a formal examination.

16457. Did you get notice of that inspection?—I got no notice of that inspection.

16458. That is required?—The regulation is that there should be a week's notice, and of course, the teachers say that a week is far too short, but I did not even get a week's notice, but the fact that my school had got “excellent” for the past five or six years left it out of the list of schools which should be submitted to a formal inspection, and we were submitted to a formal inspection.

16459. And your point is that these formal inspections were intended to be used in the case of inefficient schools?—My point is that there was a very serious injustice in my case, and I think I might argue the general case by taking a particular case. In my own particular case it was a serious injustice to come in and take the children by surprise, and submit them to an examination test without the children having proper examination conditions.

16460. Was that examination of October, 1907, apart from inspection an individual examination?—That in many subjects was an individual examination.

16461. How long did it last?—From 9.30 till 3, and on the following day from 10.5 till 11.

16462. And that you call a very thorough examination?—Well, that is exactly six hours.

16463. And I suppose the inspector alleged that your children had broken down?—He said the children in the 3rd, 4th, and 5th standards made a poor examination in arithmetic.

16464. How long was this after the school year had finished and school work had been done?—From the 1st of July, but then we have a holiday from the 1st of July to the middle of August, really, and I cannot fix the date for August.

16465. How many months had the children been at work?—Oh, I should say two and a half.

16466. Did the inspector seem to make allowance for that?—Oh, no; he just read them out a set of questions.

16467. You do not allege that he took them over a particular course?—In one particular case to which Mr. Keith himself refers, I have not my notes of the questions that were set, but I do say that he took them on one particular question that they had never done.

16468. Mr. HENLY.—Have you any evidence that the two examinations or inspections were regarded as formal inspections?—I have the evidence in my own observation book. He says: “Inspected from 9.30 to 3, and from 10.5 to 11.” That was six hours, and Mr. Kelly in the following year wrote in the observation book: “Inspected and examined from 9.30 to 4.5.”

16469. Mr. HANCOCK.—What was the size of the school?—About 100

16470. Mr. HENLY.—But that does not make it a formal inspection in the technical sense?—Well, I do not know what a formal inspection is if it is not a formal examination.

16471. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, the point that Mr. Henly puts is that your schools would not at any time be regarded as unsatisfactory?—It could not be regarded as unsatisfactory.

16472. You had got “excellent” in the previous years?—And for many years.

16473. Mr. HENLY.—The point that I am putting to you is that the mere fact of the examination at pupils would not constitute the inspection a formal inspection, and if it is not a formal inspection you are not entitled to notice.

16474. The CHAIRMAN.—What you say, Mr. McCormack, is that it was a formal inspection and that it was done illegally?—My point is this, that if it is not a formal inspection, I do not know what more severe test a school could be subjected to in the case of a formal inspection. That is my point.

16475. Now we go on to Mr. Kelly's examination?—Yes, from 9.30 to 4.5.

16476. That was, I suppose, of the same character as Mr. Keith's?—Of the same character, only that we benefited by our experience of Mr. Keith, and we knew what was to be expected.

16477. You got the same mark?—Yes, but the actual result, as far as the inspection was concerned, was different, because our experience of the previous year had taught us to know what to expect from Mr. Kelly, and the children were treated up to examination as well as inspection.

16478. But you got no better mark?—We got no better mark, but the actual results were better.

16479. You say: “I was convinced that the mark in 1907 was lower than it deserved.” On what grounds do you say that?—We had got “excellent.” There was no decline in the school as far as I could judge. Of course, I could have no documentary evidence to prove that.

16480. You go on then to make a serious allegation which you say you will prove by documentary evidence, that on Mr. Kelly's own showing the school ought to have got a higher mark than “good” in 1908. Will you have got a higher mark than “good” in 1908?—Yes, I have briefly pointed out what the evidence is?—Yes, I have handed in the documents. After that inspection of 1908 the report was not received until the 26th of January. That, of course, is an important point, because it means that appeal would be useless in two months.

16481. You were from the 6th of December to the 26th of January without receiving any account of the inspector's report?—Quite so, and the office would have said that the time had gone too far.

16482. But here is the point that I want you to come to. How do you justify that statement that you would prove that Mr. Kelly's statement was incorrect?—I hope to do so very conclusively.

16483. And that the school deserved a higher mark than it got on his own showing?—This is the minute of the report: “The general condition of the school is good, and occasional glimpses are afforded of teaching unquestionably sound. It appears to me, however, that the results are not altogether commensurate with the possibilities of the case. Greater firmness of purpose and concentration of energy would doubtless place this school in a position of unsatisfactory strength.” He goes on to say: “The rolls were not punctually marked on the date of my visit.” What I take exception to in that report is what he says about occasional glimpses. I wrote to Mr. Kelly, and I asked him did he think it was fair to say that only occasional glimpses were afforded of teaching unquestionably sound. I considered that that implied that the general teaching was not sound, and I asked him on what grounds he made that statement, and also on what evidence he based his assumption that greater firmness of purpose and concentration of energy were possible on my part, or on the part of any of the teachers. He referred to greater firmness of purpose and concentration of energy, which might have placed the school in a position of unsatisfactory strength; and

26th July, 1913.]

Mr. THOMAS E. MCGEEHAN, B.A., examined.

[Continued.]

the reply to that letter contains this: "The gist of my report was that a higher mark than 'good' might have been assigned to the school if you concentrated your energies on the work officially marked out for you." On Mr. Kelly's own showing the school was entitled to a higher mark than "good." That brings me exactly to the point. If I did so concentrate my energies then I was entitled to a higher report on Mr. Kelly's own showing. Mr. Kelly says: "What I took exception to was his teaching the intermediate programme to 6th standard pupils in the school;" that is on page 186 in your minutes. Now, there was not a single child in my school ever taught this intermediate programme within school hours.

16484. The CHAIRMAN.—That you were teaching the intermediate course within school hours?—Certainly.

16485. And you never did that?—Never in my life.

16486. What I do not understand is your putting in these letters of parents to say that their sons had never been taught the intermediate course?—I asked for the names of all the pupils who were on the 6th standard roll when Mr. Kelly made his inspection, and there were four.

16487. And you say that the report ought to have been higher than "good"?—That is my point.

16488. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—You gave a promise that you would justify that statement by showing from Mr. Kelly's own report that you ought to have got a better mark, and now you are engaged in doing that?—It simply comes to this, that Mr. Kelly says that a higher mark than "good" could be assigned to the school if I concentrated my energies on the work officially marked out for me. I did concentrate my energies in this particular year with which I am dealing. I took the alternative programme for 7th standard pupils, that is the alternative programme for 7th standard pupils which is officially authorized. I say very distinctly that Mr. Kelly took exception on the date of the inspection to the 7th standard pupils being taught the intermediate programme, and I would like to read the noting that he has made here.

16489. The CHAIRMAN.—We were talking of the 6th standard being taught the intermediate course and you say they were not?—They were not. The 7th standard of this year had taken the alternative programme which is officially authorized. That was done within school hours, and the 6th standard were not taught that year at all.

16490. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—That is, they were not taught the intermediate at all?—Not taught that course at all; but in previous years I had taught it, but never within school hours. Mr. Kelly says here that what he took exception to was the teaching of the 6th standard pupils, and that proves that he did not take exception to the teaching of the 7th standard pupils; and he says of the 7th: "Analysis in the 7th standard was highly satisfactory. The pupils of this standard do not appear to have learned the maps of England and Scotland, and they know very little of England. They have done none of the 7th standard arithmetic, and their answering in 6th standard programme arithmetic was moderate. Some of the questions, however, were framed for intelligent pupils. Singing was fair in 6th and 7th standards." Now, I say there is internal evidence to prove that Mr. Kelly examined the 7th standard pupils on the ordinary course, and not on the course on which they had been prepared, and it was on that ground, I think, alone that he lowered my report, because there is nothing else in the report or the results of the inspection that would have justified him in so doing.

16491. The CHAIRMAN.—That is what you mean by saying "on his own showing"?—No, sir.

16492. You say: "I will prove on his own showing that Mr. Kelly's report under-rated my school?—That is a vital point for me, and I hope I will be able to make it plain.

16493. I want you to illustrate the words "on his own showing"?—He says in the letter: "The gist of my report was that a higher mark than 'good' could be assigned to this school if you concentrated

your energies on the work officially marked out for you." I understood that that is referring to the 7th standard, and I was justified in so understanding it, because Mr. Kelly had taken exception to the teaching of the 7th standard pupils on the date of the inspection but it was officially correct. And then Mr. Kelly had shifted his ground to say that what he took exception to was the teaching of 6th standard pupils, and there was no such standard being taught the intermediate course of all that year, and never in the history of the school were 6th standard pupils taught the intermediate programme inside school hours; so that as a matter of fact I did concentrate my energies.

16494. Mr. EMTLE.—You had previously been teaching the intermediate programme outside school hours, and then in order to concentrate your energies you discontinued it?—Yes, I had taught it outside school hours, from half-past-three to five.

16495. And in this year you were not?—In this year I was not. In this year I had taken the 7th standard only on the alternative programme.

16496. Mr. HENSON.—The explanation I take to be this, that you were teaching the 6th standard in accordance with the programme of the National School?—Yes.

16497. And you were teaching the 7th standard the intermediate programme, which is officially recognized as a programme which is allowable for that standard to be taught?—Yes, quite so.

16498. And therefore when you were teaching the 6th standard in accordance with the ordinary programme and the 7th standard in accordance with the alternative or intermediate programme you were confining yourself strictly to work that was officially marked out for you?—That is my point exactly.

16499. Mr. HENSON.—Did you appeal?—I did not appeal. I have not known any case of appeal to be successful except one.

16500. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—You were present yourself at the examination of the 7th standard pupils on the arithmetic question?—I was present at the examination.

16501. And from your own personal knowledge and observation, being present at the examination, could you state as a matter of fact in which of the two programmes, whether the 7th standard intermediate or the ordinary programme, the questions were set?—The fact was he did not examine them at all on the work that they had done.

16502. He did not examine them on the intermediate programme?—He would not examine the intermediate programme for 7th standard at all.

16503. So he did not examine them on either?—He did not examine them on either.

16504. And then he struck out a programme of his own?—He examined them on the 6th standard programme of the previous year.

16505. He examined the 7th standard on the lower programme of the previous year?—Yes.

16506. The CHAIRMAN.—And he made his report on that?—Yes. He says: "Some of the questions, however, were framed for intelligent pupils."

16507. Mr. CONVEY.—Was this statement justified at all, that they had done none of the 7th standard arithmetic—how did he know that?—He asked me what arithmetic had they done, and I said: "These children are doing the intermediate course, the alternative programme," and he said: "I have nothing whatever to do with that. Take the ordinary programme, what have they done in the ordinary programme?" And I said: "They have not done it, they have done the intermediate, that is what they have been doing since the 1st of July"; and he would not examine on that at all.

16508. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—Did he find that the work they had actually done came nearer to the 6th standard programme than to any other?—He did not look at the work they had been actually doing at all.

16509. The CHAIRMAN.—I want you to go to the remarks of Mr. Keith that you wish to reply to?—Yes, that is page 186 in the Appendix.

16510. Will you state generally what are the attacks made by Mr. Keith on your reputation as a school

master?—Mr. Keith made no charge except in so far as he lowered my report. Of course, I hold my own private opinion that the lowering of the report is due to the influence of the senior inspector.

16513. Who was the senior inspector?—Mr. Kelly.

16512. Have you any evidence of that?—No, that is my own private opinion.

16513. Can you give us the reply that you have to make?—I would like to say on that, that Mr. Kelly says with regard to my school: "The general condition of the school was not such as to warrant," etc. That is on page 186 of the Minutes of Evidence. In the last line of the first paragraph in reference to the Nicholson Memorial school he says: "The general condition of the school was not such as to warrant the inspectors," etc.

16514. He says: "Though the school was equipped for the teaching of elementary science about nine years ago he" (that is you) "declined to teach this subject despite numerous suggestions made by Messrs. Haller and Ingold, and the local inspectors."—Yes.

16515. Is that so?—That is his statement here, and he says that I assigned as the ostensible reason that the press accommodation was insufficient.

16516. But still you admit that the teaching of science was rather neglected there?—I do not. In the statement that I have handed in you will see that the manager of this school, Mr. Greer, claimed the right under the rules of the National Board to direct the course of instruction of the school, and he said that elementary science should not be taught in the school.

16517. And you acted on his direction?—Not only so, but it was accepted by the inspectors up to 1907. The first reference to elementary science was in 1907.

16518. Mr. Keith referred to it in that year, on the 25th of October, 1907. That was the first reference to elementary science, and he then noted the absence of elementary science?—Yes; he says: "No science is taught." Mr. Keith had not spoken to me about the matter. He never mentioned science to me during the day, and I only saw this note of Mr. Keith's in the book after he went out, and I had not an opportunity of explaining to him why science was not taught.

16519. Had not an opportunity of explaining it to whom?—To Mr. Keith.

16520. And did Mr. Kelly accept that explanation?—Yes.

16521. At the time?—Yes, and he told me at the time that he thought the alternative course for the 7th standard that we were giving would exempt us from the science. The next reference to it was on the visit of Mr. Ingold. Mr. Ingold's visit was in September, 1907. He said the apparatus was to be put into the room in which it was to be used if proper press accommodation could be afforded.

16522. Do I understand you to say that the manager refused to provide you with that?—Not only refused to provide me with it, but he refused to allow the subject to be taught in the school, and after Mr. Ingold's visit and after it had been referred to by Mr. Keith, I referred the matter to the manager. I said, "It is really essential, Mr. Greer, in the interests of the school that you should consent to the teaching of elementary science in the school." He said, "No," and he said that he would not allow science to be taught.

16523. And he would not allow press accommodation?—He would not. It was not a question of press accommodation, because I would have provided that myself, but he refused to have the science taught in the school, and in the observation book he made a statement about it referring to the remarks of Mr. Keith, "I have examined the above remarks, and with the exception of the putting up of plants and pictures, and also the science, the other suggestions will be carried out." I hold that that is conclusive proof that I was not responsible for the fact that science was not taught.

16524. But Mr. Usher Greer was?—Mr. Usher Greer was, and it is proved here conclusively, and it was stating Mr. Kelly in the face when he wrote that I declined to teach the subject.

16525. Had he that remark of Mr. Usher Greer before him when he wrote that?—He had the Observation book in which it was written; he is able to tell how many times the time table was not suspended and so forth.

16526. Now go on to the second charge, that on four different occasions attention was drawn to the fact that the time table was not suspended?—He wrote in the Observation Book that the time table should be suspended in the schoolroom. I must explain here that our schoolhouse was used also as a parochial hall, and there were a great many meetings held in the schoolroom, evening meetings. It was customary for irresponsible parties to come into this room a little before the meeting, and remove the time table and put it in front of the fire to create a draught, time after time, so that the time table had been disfigured, chafed, and destroyed. In order to meet the difficulty I got a large sheet of paper and drew up the time table in proper form and fastened it with four drawing pins inside the lid of my own desk. That never was taken exception to from the year I had done it up to this, and Mr. Keith did not take much exception to it, but he said the time table should be suspended in the schoolroom; but there was a proper copy of the time table, and each teacher had a copy of the time table to work according to.

16527. I understand that this arrangement of yours went on for some time. Was there any time table in sight?—No; the teachers had copies in their note-books.

16528. No one but the head teacher could see any time table?—If a visitor wanted to see the time table I would have lifted the lid of the desk and shown him the time table inside. That, perhaps I should say, is technically wrong.

16529. I suppose it is technically wrong?—I think it is technically wrong, but I do not think it is a point that should have been emphasized to any extent.

16530. There was no great stress laid on it?—Yes, but I had not even thought of it for a long time because he had not spoken to me about the matter. In the following year he again referred to the fact that the time table was not suspended, and I then made up my mind that it was quite necessary to have this regulation complied with, so I got immediately a time-table drawn up in proper form on a large sheet of paper, and took it down to a shop to get the time-table framed and glass over it. That was the 29th of October that Mr. Keith made that reference, and then less than a month afterwards Mr. Kelly came into the school, and his first question was, "Is the time table yet suspended?" and I said, "No, Mr. Kelly; we will have it suspended in a day or two. I have sent it down to be framed and there is some delay in sending it up." And then there is no other reference until 1910, which, of course, is outside the triennial period in question. The noting here is that the time table in use is not suspended, but the teachers have copies in their note-books. There were only two minor changes, and practically the same time table was in force all the time.

16531. The next point relates to errors in written exercises not dealt with as suggested. You observe that he means that you ought to have corrected the written exercises better than you were doing?—I say there is no ground for what is conveyed here.

16532. Is there any ground at all for it?—I would say, sir, that that remark is entirely unjustified.

16533. Mr. HANCOCK.—Did he make any particular suggestion as to the mode of marking the errors?—Yes; on the 26th of October he wrote, "Errors in spelling, composition and dictation should be written out several times in the school exercises." Well, that was absurd, because that was the very thing that I had been doing all my life. I checked the errors that every child made in the school, and I kept a note-book in which these errors were recorded, and the book got smaller as you go along. Those errors that were made by the children formed the subject matter for a lesson every week, and they wrote out the wrong. Whatever mistake was made was written out.

16534. THE CHAIRMAN.—What was the exact point of his criticism—what had you not done that he wanted you to do?—I really could not tell what I had not done that he wanted me to do. I had dealt with

19th July, 1913.]

Mr. THOMAS B. MCCABE, B.A., examined.

[Continued.]

the errors to the rest of my ability. What he says in October, 1907, is "Errors in spelling in composition and dictation should be written out several times in the school exercises." That is what we had been doing.

16335. You had actually been doing that?—We had actually been doing that.

16336. Did you prove to him that you had been doing it?—I had never an opportunity of proving it because these observations are written the last thing before the inspector goes out of the school.

16337. Then you did not know that you were not doing those things that you ought to have done?—That was one of my points before Dr. Starkie. This observation book is written up the last thing before the inspector leaves the school.

16338. But the inspector did not seem to know that you were doing it?—Some of them would have resented any interference.

16339. But still my impression is from what you say that you did not give the inspector a chance of knowing the things that you were doing?—It is like this. The inspector never mentioned the errors during the day. He did not mention the matter to me, and I had no opportunity of giving an explanation. When the inspection is finished, he takes the book and writes in it, and I could not look over his shoulder. He writes and signs his name, and then closes the book and says "Good evening."

16340. Mr. HENLY.—Did he not discuss these matters with you?—Mr. Keith says he endeavored to keep his place and not allow himself to be drawn into discussion.

16341. Did he not discuss these things in the Observation Book?—No; Mr. Keith did not, and neither did Mr. Kelly. There have been inspectors that would do that. Here is one of the notes, on 7th of November, 1908:—"In the composition written by the 6th standard pupils, I noticed two errors in grammar not even marked." That was an incidental visit of the 7th of November, 1908. Mr. Keith passes round the school and looks at the books and says nothing, and I do not know what he has seen or not seen. I find after he leaves the school that he noticed errors in composition not even marked.

16342. Do you mean to say that that is not a correct observation of his?—I say how could that error be marked, for, supposing the error was there, it might remain there while I was teaching some other class.

16343. Mr. KERR.—Was it that day's written work that he examined?—Yes, certainly.

16344. Not previous ones?—No, the exercises that the pupils were doing that day.

Mr. HENLY.—It was the exercises written that day, and the time for correcting them had not come.

16345. The BRIDGE or ROOM.—But I do not think that those errors were made in the compositions that were written that particular day?—I should say that even if there were an error in composition it cannot be regarded as a very serious fault.

16346. You state that it was the composition that was written by a child that very day, which composition you yet had not time to correct?—Those were the only compositions that Mr. Kelly saw that day.

16347. He did not see any of their previous compositions?—He did not; just went round and looked at what all were doing.

16348. Would you have in the book several compositions going back for months, or would there be only one composition in the particular book that the child was writing?—Oh, no, all the compositions that the child had done.

16349. For several months?—Yes.

16350. And then the question is whether it was one of these old compositions that he found the error in?—I see your point, but I take it to be one of the compositions written that day, because so far as I know all the others were corrected. Of course, there might be one that had escaped my notice.

16351. The CHAIRMAN.—The next point is the preparing of the 6th standard pupils for intermediate examinations. Can you give a full explanation of that?—I was not preparing them.

16352. And you deny that?—I give a very emphatic denial to that.

16353. And you bring forward letters of parents showing you were not preparing boys in the 6th standard?—Yes.

16354. And that is the whole point of it?—That is the whole point of it, and even in previous years the 6th standard were never prepared inside school hours, and during that year not prepared at all.

16355. Now there is a point here in the second paragraph which has reference to Mr. Kelly. The inspectors of the Belfast district say that in the first five years of the new system the teachers were leniently dealt with, and he says that he dealt with you too leniently. Now, have you any remark to make on that?—In his report he himself says that "Greater firmness of purpose and concentration of energy would doubtless place this school in a position of unassailable strength"; so that even according to Mr. Kelly's own showing our defences were fairly strong, perhaps not impracticable.

16356. It is alleged that there seems to have been a kind of gap or interval or great variation of standard in 1903 in Belfast. That is your whole point. Have you observed that?—Yes.

16357. A sudden and very marked change in the way inspectors were treating the schools?—Yes, I certainly say that as far as I know and as far as Lishorn is concerned I do not know any school in Lishorn that occupied.

16358. We have it here in evidence that Mr. Kelly in his own style of inspection showed a great change in the standard at that very time. You understand what I mean, that in the first five years after the new system came in Mr. Kelly was lenient and in the three following years he became severe. Can you confirm that?—No, I could not give any personal evidence on that except that it is within my knowledge from hearsay that Mr. Kelly was lenient in the Co. Down.

16359. And you have heard it stated that there was a change in the style of his inspection?—Yes, I should say that his style of inspection, so far as my own school was concerned was very severe.

16360. Because several?—Was very severe.

16361. All the time?—You see I only had him once.

16362. You did not know him in the earlier time?—Quite so.

16363. He makes a serious allegation against you, that you wrote him a very impertinent letter and that you came to his house to bully him. I thought you would like to reply to that?—Well, to begin with, that method of answering the complaint of the report seems to me to be rather irrelevant.

16364. I thought you might wish to relieve yourself of the charge?—I would very much, but I would like in the first place to point out that it does not deal with the report; for instance, I do not see what any defective organisation in 1910 that Mr. Kelly referred to has to do with the report of 1907 and 1908.

16365. Do you remember that interview?—I do very well.

16366. When did it take place?—During the Christmas holidays.

16367. Mr. COFFEY.—Have you the letter you wrote him?—I have a copy of it here if required.

16368. The CHAIRMAN.—I think you had better read that?—Nicholson Memorial School, Lishorn, 28th January, 1909. Dear Mr. Kelly,—I have just received this morning a copy of the report of your inspection. I confess I am disappointed to find that only occasional glimpses were afforded you of sound teaching in this school. Do you think it is quite fair to imply so plainly, unless you are of opinion that such is the case, that the general teaching of the school is not sound. I would be glad to know from you on what evidence you base your assumption that greater firmness of purpose and concentration of energy are possible on our part. You say that the school could thus be placed in a position of unassailable strength. If I am to understand from this expression that you regard this school as a sort of stronghold marked out for your assaults, I can only say I am afraid that our defences cannot well be made secure against every possible form of attack."

16570. Mr. KERRY.—I call that next rather than important?—I may say that it was not intended to be important in any sense. As to what he says about my know-beating him, I have only got my word against him. I called on Mr. Kelly and expostulated with him about certain things he had said in the school, and certain things that he had done in his inspection, with a view to having a friendly understanding between my inspector and myself. I say here and I am absolutely certain that there was not an ungentlemanly word said, or a word of anger either by Mr. Kelly or myself at that interview. It comes to this, that this being in Mr. Kelly's own house and not in my school-house, it was very unlikely that any man would stoop to heckling and know-beating for two hours in his own house.

16571. What size is Mr. Kelly?—He is bigger than I am.

16572. Mr. HENRY.—There is one point here. You say, "I know that Mr. Kelly's manner of addressing me was very harassing when he was in my school."—That remark was brought out in the conversation. I had not intended to make that statement, but I adhere to it.

16573. In what way was it harassing?—When he came into the school he said, "I want to have the 7th standard," and then he asked, "What arithmetic have you done?" "What comes have they?" and I said, "the intermediate," and he asked them about the map of Scotland, and I said, "They have not done the map of Scotland," and he said, "I will take them on the map of Scotland and they may learn something of it; they should have had it long ago."

16574. And about those children doing the intermediate programme?—He said, "Bring up Brodies and Thimbletts (the two 7th standard pupils) and they can sing for us," although singing was not on their course at all; and he said, "They will have the satisfaction of having done one good day's work in the year."

16575. Was he not bound to examine them on the school record?—He did not do it, and I did not see what means I had of compelling him to do it. I say as a matter of fact that he examined those children the whole day on work they had not done, and showed up their ignorance to themselves and to the whole school, because the notices in the observation book show that that is where the whole stress of his observation was laid.

16576. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you any other remark to make by way of rejoinder?—I would like to refer to the letter of Mr. Greer where he says, "I have the greatest possible pleasure in saying a word with regard to Mr. Kelly and Mr. Keith's bearing towards my teachers whenever they came to my schools. Their bearing has always been such as to become their position as inspectors. They both, to my mind, acted in such a manner as to find out what the scholars really knew, and in so doing when they came in contact with the teachers their attitude was always one of kindness and tact. Perfect fairness seemed to me to mark their characters and conduct." Now I am positive that Mr. Greer was not once in the school when Mr. Kelly was present for an incidental visit or inspection.

16577. The CHAIRMAN.—Was he ever present when Mr. Keith was there?—Well, he was once for a few minutes, but I do not see how anyone could give a testimonial as to what the inspector's bearing during the whole day had been and that it was correct and so forth if he was only there for a few minutes. I do not see the value of that testimonial, but of course, I do not want to say anything about Mr. Greer giving it.

16578. The BURNER or ROSE.—Might Mr. Greer have been present at some of the other schools at Letcham—there are other schools?—There are.

16579. Because this is not in reference to you alone but this is in reference to all the teachers in the district?—He says, "My teachers."

16580. Has he other schools?—Yes; he was at that time the manager of two other schools. Those are the three schools.

16581. The CHAIRMAN.—He had two schools besides yours?—Yes.

16582. And he might have got those inspectors there?—I would certainly say that the very point of that was to disprove my statement. If that testimonial has any point at all it is to disprove the statement that Mr. Kelly's manner was harassing to me.

16583. The BURNER or ROSE.—But if he had 50 other teachers to testify that his manner was good it would greatly weaken your statement that his manner was harassing to you?—That is so, but he had not 50 teachers.

16584. Mr. HENRY.—But apart from the mark which you think was not fair, do you attach much importance to his manner?—No, I would attach no importance to it whatever, and I did not intend to make any reference to the bearing of the inspectors in the schools. I say if the inspection system is amended, as we hope it will be, complaints of this sort will gradually disappear.

16585. The BURNER or ROSE.—A statement is made in this document?—"Even pupils of the 7th and 8th standards cannot be prepared for the intermediate without the inspector's recommendation." Is that statement correct?—That is technically correct, my lord.

16586. Had you the inspector's recommendation for the preparation of these pupils in 7th standard?—There were only two in the 7th standard, and I had the recommendation in so far as I had told Mr. Kelly at an incidental visit in 1907 that for the ensuing year, that is 1908, I proposed to take the alternative course.

16587. And there were only two pupils?—There were only two pupils.

16588. In that 7th standard?—In that 7th standard.

16589. So all we have been hearing then is in reference to these two pupils?—That is so, my lord, and not only that but the time table was submitted to the inspector, and it made provision for the teaching of the programme.

16590. Mr. HENRY.—Did he sign the time table?—Oh, no, they never sign the time table; I do not suppose in our district you would get half a dozen.

16591. Mr. CONYER.—He raised no objection to your adoption of that programme?—Not at that time.

16592. The CHAIRMAN.—Are you anxious to go into this Hull case?—No, Sir Samuel. I would like to say a word simply to try to put myself right because the action of the teachers in bringing this case forward was misinterpreted. It never was intended to be taken as the immediate cause of Mr. Hull's death.

16593. The irritation of inspectors?—Yes.

16594. Well put it briefly to us without going into the case. What did the teachers wish to allege?—The teachers wished to allege that here was one particular case in which the school worry, not the personal worry of the inspectors, but the school worry had proved too much for that teacher; it never was intended, and anyone who made my statement before Dr. Starke will see that it never was intended to implicate the inspectors personally.

16595. You have got it now on the notes that the only allegation that you wished to make was that Mr. Hull's end was due to the worry about the reports and not to the harassing action of the inspector?—Not only so, but I am glad to have an opportunity to make that statement. I never intended and no teacher ever intended, and although Mr. Kelly has taken it in this way, and as you will see, has referred again and again to charges that were never made, I say that it was never intended in any way by the teachers to implicate any inspector personally, but simply that it was due to the strain and worry and uncertainty from year to year. Watching for the inspector to come and thinking how he should be treated had proved very severe upon the teachers in many cases, and here was one particular case in which it absolutely proved too much.

16596. I will ask you to leave it at that, and I think your statement will gain in effect rather than the reverse by letting it end just there?—Very well, sir.

18996. Mr. HENNINGSON.—You lost your increment by getting that "good" report in 1908?—That is so.

18997. Have you since got it?—I have not.

18998. You have not had increment since?—I am in Hilden school, and I have not only not got increment since, but in Hilden school Mr. Kelly inspected me the first year I went there and he gave me "fair."

18999. You told me before that you never have appeared against a decision yourself?—That is so.

19000. And, of course, you were one of the memorialists?—Yes.

19001. And you were one of the schools which were affected by the general lowering of the marks, was it not?—Yes.

19002. Was yours one that was selected for re-examination?—No, it was not.

19003. I think that out of the 13 that were selected the inspectors who conducted that re-examination found that in two cases the lowering was unjustifiable in their opinion. Did they not?—I think so.

19004. And then it may be presumed that had the whole 111 which were affected been re-examined there would have been something like 16 or 17 teachers who had suffered by the lowering, in the opinion of those people who conducted the re-examination?—Oh, yes, if you mean in the opinion of those who conducted the re-examination.

19005. Therefore we may assume that in a fair percentage of cases the teachers did suffer by that sudden lowering unjustly?—That is so.

19006. Now, what I want to ask you is this, has there been any redress given in any one case?—Not so far as I am aware.

19007. So far as you are aware that re-examination has not given redress to any individual teacher?—No, so far as I am aware. I believe I am correct in saying that it has not.

19008. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—I want to make sure, Mr. McLEOD, that you have had an opportunity of stating every point that you wish to refer to. There is nothing further that you wish to bring before me?—Not so far as my own case is concerned, but I hope I have made that rather plain.

19009. The CHAIRMAN.—You say that the true facts about inspection in the district in which you were are not yet known. Do you remember stating that?—I do, Sir.

19010. What did you mean when you said that?—What I meant to say was this, that the percentages of "very goods" and "excellents" in one year as compared with another do not give an accurate indication of the true state of the case, because a certain number of men who are "good" in one year may be raised to "excellent" and men who are "excellent" in the same year may be lowered to "good," so I mean to say that really possibly a great many more suffered than the percentages would seem to show.

19011. That a great many more have really suffered than the percentages seem to show?—That is so. Supposing I take a dozen schools and the 12 teachers are eligible for promotion to first of first grade and the 12 teachers require three successive "very goods" to obtain promotion, I do not say for a moment that this was so in every case, but I want to show how the percentages could work out. Supposing they got "very good" in the first year and the second year, and then in the third year of the triennial period only four of them get "very good," while the others get only "good," though they deserve a higher mark, in that case you would have 66 per cent. of "very goods" and "excellents" in the district, not one of which would be entitled to increment or promotion. There is only one way to get the true facts, and that is to have a return, which, of course, is not available to me, of the actual number of teachers who were eligible for increment or promotion and the actual number who have their increment or promotion stopped or delayed by the report. It appears to me that there is only one way in which the facts of the case can be ascertained, and that is by asking for a report or return of the actual number of teachers in a district or circuit who would have been eligible for increment or promotion and the actual number of those who have had their increment or

promotion stopped or delayed as the result of an inspection.

19012. You were asked about actual redress of any of those grievances. Have the teachers ever gone to the Board to ask for redress?—In the memorial we ask for redress.

19013. For all that have been depressed?—For all who have suffered. If you take these percentages as the minutes of evidence, page 107, you find the Chief Inspectors give the number of "very goods" as follows:—In 1904-5 the number was 182; in the following year, 179; next year, 1906-7, 182; the following year, 114; next year, 110; and next year, 112. Now, by a very ingenious system of points the Chief Inspectors have proved that the fall of "very goods" from 182 to the new triennial period, the 114 being in another triennial period, is 6 per cent.

19014. We know all about those figures. Have you any other point you wish to bring before me?—Yes; though it was not the year for the Senior Inspector to take Hilden School, I would like to state that Mr. Kelly took my school in Hilden the first year that I was there, and that was the year immediately following the depostition.

19015. You are in Hilden now?—I am in Hilden now. Well, the result of that inspection was "fair."

19016. The school was marked "fair"?—The school was marked "fair."

19017. The SENIOR or ROSE.—What was the mark it has been getting before?—"Fair."

19018. Had it fallen to "fair" before you went there?—Yes, but I am afraid this "fair" is not the result of that. I would just like to read what he says here.

19019. The point before you is this, that if a school has fallen it requires some time to pull it up?—Yes, my lord. This is the report:—"If the principal teacher were induced with as keen a sense of his duties and responsibilities as his assistants are with theirs, this report would be much more favourable. The proficiency in reading and arithmetic was in the main good, and the reading of some pupils in second standard very good," and so on.

19020. Now, whose report is that?—Mr. Kelly's.

19021. Mr. HENLEY.—Was that for last year?—"Dublin, 15th May, 1912." That is the time that I received the report of an inspection held on the 11th of December.

19022. The CHAIRMAN.—The report was not forwarded to you for nearly five months. That is what you allege?—That is so.

19023. Mr. HENLEY.—Is there anything more in the report only what you have read about reading and arithmetic?—Oh, yes; and the reading of some pupils in second standard was very good. The progress made in history is satisfactory, but the drawing as it has been taught is worthless as far as in the 3rd and higher standards. That is one of the subjects that I was responsible for, drawing in the 3rd and higher standards. "The other subjects tested were 'fair,' though the writing was bad in the case of senior infants." That is another subject for which I was responsible. "The teaching of geography was overlooked in third standard. Rule 128 (b) has been neglected. Several pupils in 1st standard had no readers or copy-books, although I should say there was an ample supply of books provided through the generosity of the patron, Mr. Milne Barber." The point I want to make is that it was a severe report. You see in the beginning of it that I had not a sense of my duties and responsibilities, and yet from 1900 to 1910 I had always been getting favourable reports.

19024. Mr. KERR.—Is it your suggestion that you were treated vindictively?—I would not like to use the word vindictively; I would prefer to say that I was treated severely.

19025. Mr. CONNELL.—You used the expression that if the system was amended you did not think there would be any ground for complaint in the future. What exactly did you mean by amending the system?—Well, the teachers are most anxious to see the merit marks entirely abolished, and they hope to see the rules as to increment and promotion very strongly

1918 July, 1918.]

Mr. THOMAS B. MCCORMACK, B.A., Chairman.

[Continued.]

modified, and they are most anxious that increments should be automatic unless there is a severe official censure.

16626. You think that a great deal of the friction and unpleasantness which have arisen between the inspectors and the teachers or between the office and the teachers would disappear if the merit marks disappeared?—Yes, provided that when the merit marks disappeared there were some satisfactory arrangement. It would be worse than ever if increments were left depending on the private report of the inspector or anything like that.

16627. Do you think it would be more satisfactory to the teachers if the schools were thoroughly examined or simply inspected—which do you think would be likely to give more satisfaction?—I represent two associations here. I am here from Belfast, and I am also nominated as one of the teachers who represent my own association here. Well, I can give you a satisfactory opinion of our Limerick Association on that point. They feel that the inspection if it were properly conducted would tend more to secure efficient teaching than examination, because our conviction is that examination does tend to a perfunctory style of teaching and that it is quite possible (and it is my own experience that children can be very soon reached for examination, and when the examination is over the child has gained very little. That is my own personal experience. And I know that the Limerick teachers agree with me on that point. The inspection should be sympathetic and it should not be examination, and if there is to be examination at all it should certainly be held at or about the end of the school year.

16628. And do you think it decidedly unfair to examine a school as your school was examined, in 2½ months after the commencement of the school year?—Oh, that is the most preposterous thing that could be imagined. Nobody can conceive the hardship it imposes on the teachers. It comes to this, that it is impossible for a teacher to show his work at the end of 2½ months.

16629. Now, on another point, you say that the teachers did not appeal for two reasons, as I understood from you, first, that the minute came to them too late to appeal effectively, and, secondly, that they regarded it as useless, for they had never heard of a successful appeal?—The second is the main reason that the teachers have not appealed. The experience of teachers is that the man that appeals not only fails in his appeal, but that it is not so well for him afterwards.

16630. Do you not think that apart from that there is a practical difficulty in the way of appeal if the

minute is held back, as it has been held back in your case and some other cases, for two or three months?—Oh, yes, they often say that it is impossible to tell what the state of the school was at the time of the inspection.

16631. The CHAIRMAN.—You are satisfied now that you have brought out all your points?—Yes, if I made the point clear that I was entitled to a higher mark than "good" in 1906. That is all. Then as to Rule 128 (b) being neglected, I must refer to that if I am not tedious. There have been representations made as to Rule 128 (b) being neglected, and I was severely reprimanded on that point.

16632. Mr. HENRY.—What was the reprimand for?—It came to this, that the position in Hilden is a very peculiar one. The play hour was from half-past one to two. The Board's rule says that only attendance can be insisted where there are four hours of secular instruction. Our secular instruction, from 10 o'clock, went on without ceasing till half-past one. That was the condition of affairs as I found it in Hilden for secular instruction, and then from half-past one to two was play hour, and I kept a record of all the children who did not come back after play hour, and I would mark off any children who did not come back.

16633. A child who did not come back would only get three and a half hours' present?—Yes, that is four hours including the play hour.

16634. Does the play hour imply that the child should be present in the playground or under the control of the teacher during that half hour?—Oh, yes, I think I was technically wrong.

16635. Sir HERMAN WELLS.—Under the rule 128 (b) the minimum is 3½ hours?—Four hours including the play hour. That is half an hour for play.

16636. "No regulation can be sanctioned by which the time of secular instruction of any pupil is reduced below 3½ hours daily, including dinner time?"

—That was the point on which I relied. I relied on that point which you have read, and to be safe on the point I kept a record of all the pupils who did not return after play hour, so that I could have gone back and corrected the whole thing from the very first if it had been necessary, and I showed Mr. Kelly that list of names, but I was severely reprimanded.

16637. What was the point for which you were really reprimanded?—For neglecting Rule 128 (b).

16638. That was all that they said?—That was practically all.

16639. The CHAIRMAN.—You admit that technically you were wrong?—I admit that technically I was wrong.

Mr. JOHN EDWARD LARMOUR, Principal of St. James's National School, Antrim Road, Belfast, examined.

16640. The CHAIRMAN.—You are Principal of St. James's National School?—Yes, of St. James's National School on Antrim Road.

16641. The manager there is the Rector?—The manager is the Rector of the Church, the Rev. T. G. Collins, successor to the late Dean Bristowe.

16642. You were under Dean Bristowe for some years?—For 22 years.

16643. Have you been 22 years master of that school?—I have been master of that school since the September of the year 1895.

16644. What is your present grade under the National Board?—I am first of first grade.

16645. How long have you been first of first?—I have been first of first since the introduction of the new system. The grading only came in at that time, and I had been a first of first class teacher since my appointment to St. James's School in 1895.

16646. What are the numbers at that school?—Our average attendance runs from 140 to 150.

16647. And how many assistants have you?—I have three assistants in the school.

16648. Men or women or both?—The assistants are all ladies.

16649. Has your merit mark been reduced in the last eight years?—My merit mark has been reduced from "excellent" down to "fair."

16650. When was your last "excellent"?—My last "excellent" was in the year 1906.

16651. And what inspector gave you that?—I do not remember the inspector.

16652. When did the first reduction of your merit mark take place?—October, 1904.

16653. And who was the inspector?—Mr. Kelly was the inspector.

16654. Mr. Kelly reduced you in 1904?—Yes.

16655. And what was the mark you got then?—I got "very good" that year.

16656. And had you a further reduction after 1905?—The following year I was reduced by Mr. Mangan to "good."

16657. That was in 1906?—Well, it really ran on three months beyond the following school year until the January of 1907.

16658. We may say that Mr. Mangan in the following year reduced you to "good"?—Practically, at the next general examination.

16659. And that was in 1906-7?—Yes.

I

18660. Had you any further reduction?—The year following I was raised to "very good" by Mr. Fenton, and the year following that I was lowered by Mr. Welby to "good," and the year after that to "fair" by Mr. Kelly.

18661. That would be the year 1880?—That was the year 1880.

18662. And you were reduced to "fair"?—To "fair."

18663. By Mr. Kelly?—By Mr. Kelly.

18664. Did you come to any conclusion about the reduction of your own merit mark from what you had based on to the variation of standard in the district?—I came to the conclusion from what happened in my own case, and from conversations with a very large number of teachers (I probably know more teachers than any man in Ireland outside the Secretary)—I came to the conclusion that there was a very great raising of the standard in Belfast, because I found some men who were supposed to be the very ablest teachers, whose previous record showed them to have been the very ablest teachers, had been reduced. St. Mark's, that had "excellent," was reduced that year two steps.

18665. And you have the impression that about 1886 there was a considerable raising of the standard?—Yes.

18666. That was about the date?—It was.

18667. And that was the principal cause that compelled you to present yourselves before the Resident Commissioner?—It was one of the causes.

18668. I thought it was the principal cause?—It was the principal cause. Another cause was our belief that the premises were taken into account in the awards of these merit marks to the school.

18669. In your own experience can you show that that had affected your merit mark?—I believe that if you take those reports on any school, of which I have headed a copy to your Secretary, beginning with my history of the school, and the reports on the school from the time I entered it in 1887, if you look to page 8 of that I think you will see there, in November, 1903, that Mr. Mangin says: "The school-room wants doing up, brightening. Walls are getting dirty." And a little further down he notes defects in the equipment of the school: "Another work-table would be a useful acquisition. Lime-washing is required at present and painting of wood-work." From that forward, in all the observations that are made in my school, there is a continual reference to the necessity of the doing up of the school and the painting of the school. Funds were not available; otherwise it would have been done.

18670. Have your manager or managers funds for the proper upkeep of the school?—Nothing. The manager has no funds in hand except the voluntary contributions of his congregation.

18671. And are these collections made?—Collections are made, and an annual contribution is given or an offering by the people.

18672. Money is collected by private subscriptions?—By private subscriptions in the congregation.

18673. Are these contributions adequate for the upkeep of the school?—Oh, not by any means; they were not at that time; the congregation was small at that time.

18674. Have you ever had to pay any of those things out of your own pocket?—Very little; I think on a couple of occasions I had something to pay for coal.

18675. Have you ever had personally to try to raise money for the upkeep of the school?—No, I have not had to do that.

18676. But you think the defects of the upkeep and equipment have affected your merit mark?—I believe that was the main item.

18677. Did you gather that from remarks of inspectors?—I gather that from the observations which I have included here, which I have underlined.

18678. Is it possible that they might have made those observations without allowing them to affect the merit mark?—Oh, it is quite possible.

18679. You know that the Board say in one paragraph of the General Report that these things are not to affect the mark, but that they are rather to count in favour of the teacher, on the ground that he is working under great disadvantages?—I intended to point out that on the occasion of the interview that the teachers

had with Dr. Starke, Dr. Starke said that no general instruction had been issued to the inspectors with regard to these things, and I wanted to point out that one of the circulars to the inspectors that you have included in your blue book did refer to this matter, and impressed on the inspectors that they should take the appearance of the premises and the equipment of the premises into account in awarding merit marks.

18680. But it is in favour of the teacher we have been told. You thought they were to be taken into account against the teacher?—In the appendix to the First Report of this Committee, on page 413, second column, about the eighth paragraph down, it says:—"Subject to the foregoing, you are at liberty to recommend deserving principal teachers in your circuits whose efficiency, judged by the work done in their school, by the general condition of the schools and out-offices as regards sanitary and hygienic arrangements, by the cleanliness and brightness of the school-rooms, by their own assistance and that of the pupils," etc. I wish to point out that it says there that the efficiency of the teachers is to be judged by the sanitary and hygienic arrangements of the schools in addition to the arrangements of the out-offices.

18681. You take that to mean that if there are in a bad state it operates against the teacher?—Decidedly.

18682. But the Board put a different construction on their own clause?—Well the statement is made there distinctly.

18683. You know No. 2 of the General Report about the equipment and buildings, and so on?—I understand perfectly well, so far as the circulars are concerned, that there is very little that one could base evidence on in the circulars, but it seems to me that in these circulars it is distinctly held up to the inspectors that they are to take those things into account. This is 1906, and we say that in our group of districts round about Belfast, in those two circuits which radiate out from Belfast there was about this year that wholesale reduction, as we call it.

18684. Mr. CORNER.—And you say you have not recovered from it since?—Oh, we have recovered to a large extent from it since, because they have been raising some of these reports for the year or two.

18685. The CHAIRMAN.—You know these better?—Yes. It was pointed out by the chief inspectors, at the deputation that we had with Dr. Starke, that in 1910 the reports had been raised at that time, and a very large proportion of the teachers had their reports higher than they had had them before; but the teachers contended that they never should have been lowered in the way that they were.

18686. You had 111 schools with the teachers protesting?—We had 111 schools out of an estimate of 704 schools.

18687. Did you make any demand for re-inspection of the schools that had been lowered?—We made no individual demands for re-inspection of the schools, but we hoped by our memorial to the Commissioners, and by our deputation, that the Commissioners would take some notice to inquire into why there was this wholesale reduction of reports.

18688. Did you expect a separate re-inspection of the schools that complained of the reduction?—We expected that the whole of those schools that sent up the memorial would have been tested over again.

18689. The whole of them?—The whole of them.

18690. Was that the reason you would not mention any smaller number of schools for re-inspection?—That was the main reason.

18691. Did you state the reason?—I could not say distinctly.

18692. The Resident Commissioner or Secretary complained that you would not name certain schools for re-inspection?—I think you will find in the letters* that Mr. Knight sent up that he pointed out that we could not name schools, because we did not know the particulars of the schools, and we could not allow ourselves to be taken by sample.

18693. Did you know the marks at that time?—We know of the reductions of the marks, but we could not say which schools would be the best to be tested as to whether the mark had been wrongly reduced or not.

* Vide Appendix XLV.

MID JULY, 1913.]

MR. JOHN EDWARD LAMMOT, EXAMINED.

[Continued]

16694. But you had really trustworthy evidence, had you not, about a large number of reductions?—Yes, we had, and the census which was taken by two of the managers in this group of districts, and which took in something like 128 schools, showed that the reduction amounted to something like 41 per cent.

16695. Did you notice in any of the inspectors who were said to make the sudden change in the standard about the year 1906—did you notice in any one of them that he had been lenient or had given higher marks before 1906, and then suddenly lowered them?—Mr. Kelly was the inspector that I came most in contact with, and certainly his standard was much higher.

16696. Do you mean that the standard rose at a certain time?—Yes, the standard rose about that time.

16697. Mr. Hume.—And the marks were lowered?—And the marks were lowered in consequence, but the lowering of the merit marks of the schools all round was considered at that time was mainly due to the fact that they were now taking into account the state of the buildings.

16698. The CHAIRMAN.—You have put in reports of inspectors from the year 1901. Was that on the whole district?—That as on the whole two circuits preceded over by six inspectors.

16699. Do you wish to hand in that as an important part of your evidence?—I hand that in as part of my evidence.—

Reports of Inspectors of N.B. in re Teachers. Appendix, Section 1, Report 68, year 1904, p. 72. Chief Inspector, Mr. A. Purser.—“As to the teachers’ desire, whatever may be their ability to carry out the views of the Board, and to give every assistance in their power to make the new programme successful, there can happily be no doubt; all the inspectors bear witness to the fact—‘whole-hearted endeavour’ is the expression used by several.” Mr. Purser then gives some extracts from some of the Inspectors’ Reports.

REPORT 68, YEAR 1903.

P. 78.—Mr. P. J. Kelly.—“I gladly bear testimony to the anxiety exhibited by the teachers in general to adapt themselves to the requirements of the revised programme. . . . It was not on easy matter for those who were accustomed to the routine of the results system to catch the spirit of the new Code. It is, therefore, gratifying to find that a ready response has been made to the call of the Commissioners. . . .”

P. 81.—Mr. Sample.—“The teachers are an intelligent body . . . who realise fully the responsible character of the duties they have undertaken, and, in the great majority of cases, discharge them to the best of their ability.”

REPORT 69, YEAR 1903.

P. 133.—Mr. Ross.—“Turning from the more or less unfavourable conditions as to buildings and equipment under which the school work is carried on, to the teachers who carry on the work, the outlook is much more encouraging. In the city and suburbs the teachers appear to have caught in a large measure the energy of purpose and business instincts of the community. . . .”

Throughout the entire area of the circuit the teachers are continuing to display the most praiseworthy eagerness in availing themselves of opportunities of becoming acquainted with the new subjects of the revised programme. A large majority of assistant teachers throughout the circuit are women. In the city most of these have served their time in large schools as maistresses, and during their apprenticeship they acquired the skill in teaching and controlling large classes. They are for the most part willing, active workers, and for the sustained energy with which they discharge their onerous duties I have nothing but unqualified praise.

REPORT 70, YEAR 1903.

P. 138.—Mr. O’Connell.—“The teachers as a body are well qualified for their work, and they discharge their duties with steadiness, fidelity, and success. So far as I am aware, they are all anxious to improve their skill and attainments, and I know that in several instances they have attended organizers’ classes in some subject or other at much personal inconvenience.”

P. 138.—Mr. Ross.—“Of course, among such a large body of teachers as is to be found in the circuit, some are more or less ramblers in the discharge of their duties, but the overwhelming majority are anxious and painstaking workers, while many—especially in the city—display an earnestness of purpose that may fairly be described as professional enthusiasm. There has been a widely-spread and sustained effort to qualify, as far as opportunities have offered, for teaching the new branches.”

P. 139.—Mr. Sample.—“With regard to the principal teachers of the Belfast schools, I can speak in the highest terms. All, or nearly all, are well qualified—some eminently so—and as a rule discharge their duties with zeal and skill. Many display much tact and ability in the conduct of schools with large staffs of assistant teachers, over whom they have a little direct authority. The great majority of these assistants are untrained, but under energetic, skilful principals their work is nearly always good. The rural teachers as a body are not to be compared with their colleagues in the city.”

P. 140.—Mr. Ross.—“With regard to proficiency, there can be no doubt that better work is possible under the existing system than could be done under the hard and fast lines of the results code.”

P. 137.—Mr. Kelly.—“My colleagues and myself are unanimous in testifying to the earnestness, assiduity, and efficient discharge of duty on the part of the teachers of the circuit. I, myself, have been agreeably surprised to find so many really efficient teachers in the section of which I have immediate charge. A large number of the schools are ‘excellent’ or ‘very good,’ and very few fall below ‘good.’ A special word of praise is due to the assistant teachers in the city schools, almost all of whom are women. In industry, zeal, manner, and general efficiency they hold a high rank as teachers. . . . there is no proper place here (Belfast) for the idler.”

P. 130.—Mr. Kelly.—“I am convinced that the freedom now given to inspectors in regard to inspection and examination will soon effect a marked change for the better in the teaching of Arithmetic.”

YEAR 1904.

P. 79.—Mr. Ross.—“Notwithstanding the serious drawbacks . . . arising from badly planned schoolrooms and irregular attendance, I believe that primary education in this circuit is steadily improving.”

REPORT 71, YEAR 1904.

P. 79.—Mr. Ross.—“With regard to the city teachers, I quote some of the following remarks of Mr. Sample.—‘The principal teachers of the Belfast schools are the best, or among the best, in the country. Not only are their attainments and skill much above the average, but they are imbued with an admirable spirit of loyalty to the Commissioners, and an unshaken desire to comply with their regulations. . . . But whatever the preparatory training of assistants for their work has been, their tone is in nearly every case taken from the principal. The measure of his efficiency is the measure of theirs. The professional zeal of these city teachers is shown by their desire to attend the classes held by organizers and others in order to qualify themselves in the new subjects of the programme. The result is that in nearly all the Belfast schools the revised programme of instruction is taught in its entirety.’”

REPORT 72, YEAR 1905.

P. 156.—Mr. Chambers.—“Of the teachers in my section of the circuit I can speak in the highest terms; they are an intelligent, conscientious, and efficient body of public servants. The chief object of the majority of them is to train the children committed to their care to become intelligent and useful citizens. During my visits to the schools I have found that most of the teachers make considerable preparation for their work, and although this preparation is sometimes of little assistance to them in the instruction of their pupils, it shows a desire on their part to qualify themselves for the efficient discharge of their onerous duties. Many of the teachers have put themselves to

16th July, 1918.]

Mr. JAMES EDWARD LAMMONT, examined.

[Continued.]

considerable expense and trouble to become acquainted with the most approved methods of teaching the subjects that have recently been introduced into the school curriculum, and the classes conducted by the organisers in Elementary Science and Music have been well attended. There is ample evidence that the teachers as a whole are beginning to adopt new methods, and to show an initiative in their work that was formerly lacking."

YEAR 1905.

P. 135.—Mr. Kelly:—"Mr. Keith has also a high opinion of his teachers.—The teachers are intelligent and skilful. The principals act judiciously in their dealings with subordinates and pupils on the one hand, and with the parents on the other. The assistants are competent, discharge their duties carefully, and act in harmony with their chiefs. The teachers continue to show an interest in the new subjects. A number attended a course of Elementary Science at Antrim and a few at Holywood. Instruction is more systematic, and the work done is periodically recorded. In many cases the amount to be attempted has been carefully planned into periods beforehand. It is common to find a number of notes on a few of these subjects. . . . My opinion of the teachers in Section C agrees in the main with that of my colleagues."

P. 136.—Mr. Kelly:—"Mr. Chambers' returns show that he has given 'very good' or 'excellent' to one-third of the country schools and to nearly half of the city schools, while practically three-fourths have obtained at least 'good.' Mr. Keith has given 'very good' or 'excellent' to one-fifth of the country schools, and to a little more than half of the city schools, while 'good' or higher has been assigned to nearly three-fourths. Section C returns.—'Very good' or 'excellent' has been received by about one-fourth of the country schools, and 60 per cent. of the city schools, while practically all received 'good' or higher, and of country schools 88 per cent. not lower than 'good.' A glance at these figures will show that the standard of proficiency in the circuit is very satisfactory. Many causes contribute to this result. Under the result system there was no part of Ireland where for the same number of schools there were so many well-paid principals as in Belfast. This city, as a consequence, was a happy hunting ground for teachers from all parts of the country. The keen competition for these posts led to a concentration in Belfast of some of the very best teaching talents in Ireland. In character, experience, ability, and attainments the principal teachers of Belfast, as a body, should, therefore, hold a very high place in the teaching profession. The assistant teachers, too, who are mostly women, are conscientious, circumspect, and efficient in the discharge of their duties. . . . This circuit, therefore, stands at an advantage compared with rural circuits, which contain a much smaller number of large schools. Again, the attendance in this circuit is more regular than in the average circuit. Life, too, in a community which thinks of business, and minds its business, is conducive to that physical and mental vigour which makes for efficiency in teaching as in everything else."

REPORT 75, YEAR 1906.

P. 29.—Mr. Dewar:—"The teachers are able and industrious, and discharge their onerous duties with considerable success. The conditions under which they labour are often unfavourable and prohibitive of the highest class of work, but under manifold disadvantages they display an admirable spirit, and perform their daily tasks with ardour and zeal. It is scarcely possible to speak too approvingly of the assistant mistresses, who bring to their work a sympathy, earnestness, and devotion which must exert upon their scholars a refining and elevating influence. . . . While the teachers are faithful and desirous of giving their best to the public, I fear they have not taken full advantage of the freedom and liberty conferred upon them by the late rules. There is still a strong tendency to frame their work and direct their instruction on the lines of the inspector's examination. Instead of taking the code as their guide, and using their own judgment as

to the best methods of carrying out provisions, they have allowed their own initiative to lie dormant, and have become followers rather than leaders in educational affairs."

REPORT 75, 1906.

Pp. 29-30.—Mr. O'Connell:—"The teachers discharge their duties faithfully and with considerable success, having regard to the unfavourable circumstances under which many of them labour, by reason of the defective and unsuitable accommodation. They usually make preparation for their work, and are anxious to carry out the wishes of the Commissioners in respect to the education of their pupils."

REPORT 74, 1907.

P. 135.—Mr. Mangan:—"As a body the teachers are industrious and devoted to their duties. No words of praise could be too extravagant in describing their earnestness and zeal in the interest of the children in their charge. . . . On the whole, they are an excellent body of public servants. I have always found them eager and willing to co-operate with me in the working of their schools; anxious to take any practical suggestions made to them, ready to adopt them; kind and sympathetic to the pupils; glad to see them advance in learning, and happy at their progress. I shall always look back with pleasure to my dealings with them and my stay in the section."

Pp. 135-6.—Mr. Kelly:—"I feel assured the teachers deserve in the main the praise he (Mr. Mangan) has bestowed on them. . . . There are too many competing schools, with result that the teachers have not always a free hand in dealings with the pupils. The attendance is often irregular. The buildings are not well adapted for teaching purposes. . . . Many children do not possess their school requisites, so that the teachers have to supply them gratis, if they are to be supplied at all. In one school I found a number of pupils without story books, because they are not able to buy them, and in another school several pupils were doing nothing during some of the lessons because they had no slates. In this school the pupils were expected to provide their own slates. They (teachers) have frequently to pay in whole or in part for the heating of the rooms. Maps, cards, globes, and pictures are occasionally provided for them. Some have to pay caretakers, and others are responsible for repairs and the general upkeep of the buildings. In fact, if the teacher had declined to spend a penny on the schools I should have to write on the margin of this report.—The bankruptcy of National education in Belfast."

Mr. Kelly then cites typical examples. Under head of "Proficiency" he says of the schools in his circuit:—"14 equal 'excellent,' 80 equal 'very good,' 174 equal 'good,' 83 equal 'fair,' 11 equal 'middling,' 1 equal 'bad,' total 362."

REPORT 75, YEAR 1908.

P. 31.—Mr. Dewar:—"The teachers are on the whole industrious, and perform their duties with energy and zeal. They make careful preparation for their work, and are anxious to attend classes which may help them to gain fresh information and experience, or to acquire new methods of imparting knowledge. In the preparation of their notes, and in the manner of using their prepared notes, great improvement is noticeable. Formerly their notes were carefully laid past, and only produced when required at the visit of an inspector; now it is not unusual to find the notes in the teacher's hand when the lesson is being taught. The notes are also of a much more practical kind; they are short, concise, and definite; hints on the orderly arrangement of the lessons, or on the different points which require special stress and treatment."

1908.

P. 31.—Mr. O'Connell:—"The teachers as a body attend carefully to their duties; they make preparation for their work, and they are anxious for the success of their schools. Several of them attend University classes at considerable inconvenience, while others attend classes in special subjects, as cookery, sciences, etc. They are progressive in ideas, and anxious to adopt

1868 July, 1913.]

Mr. JOHN EDWARD LARMOUR, examined.

[Continued.]

new methods, when they are satisfied of their soundness. As evidence I would instance that the blackboard is largely utilised in the teaching of reading, writing, composition, object lessons, and such subjects."

P. 52.—Mr. McMillan:—"As a body the teachers are competent to discharge their duties. . . . Many of the teachers who are looking for training diplomas make useful preparation for their work, but in a great many cases, especially in the case of teachers who have been a number of years engaged at work, the evidence of study and of the thoughtful consideration of how they are to render their instruction most interesting and efficient, is far from satisfactory. Preparation of a kind, at least, is usually made for object lessons, and occasionally a very good lesson is given. . . . frequently the notes are written out for the object lesson, the printed notes of a teachers' journal being substituted."

P. 53.—Mr. Down:—"The proficiency shows an upward trend, but the rate of progress depends on so many factors, over which the pupils and teachers have not full control, that the improvement is not always proportionate to the energy exerted or the thought and skill expended. The school-rooms are not always suitable for the work to be done in them. They are so large that several teachers with no many classes are engaged at the same time in them. The divisions between the class spaces are not well defined, and the class space is often so limited as to necessitate overcrowding. If order and discipline are not satisfactory, the consequent restlessness and noise distract both teachers and pupils. The work of one class interferes with the work of the others, and detracts from the general efficiency."

January 16, 1909.

P. 56.—Mr. Kelly:—"The teachers are a deserving body of public servants. They discharge their duties with zeal and efficiency, and a special word of praise is due to the assistants in Belfast, who perform their arduous duties with unflinching energy. The principals, too, are teachers of high character, and, with a few exceptions, they set an example of skill and devotion to duty."

P. 58.—Mr. Keith:—"The teachers continue to give evidence of a desire to improve their acquaintance with the new subjects introduced in recent years. . . . Preparation for work and the keeping of progress records are customary now."

P. 60.—Mr. Lavell:—"The teachers as a body are faithful in the discharge of their duties. Meticulous zeal and ability in the teaching and training of children are met with. . . . Many of them work under unenvied circumstances. . . . Many of the teachers of infant schools have spared neither time nor expense in fitting themselves for the teaching of infants on up-to-date lines."

P. 62.—Mr. Kelly:—"I have calculated the percentage of schools that have obtained 'excellent,' 'very good,' etc., and find that the results are practically the same as they were two years ago. About 25 per cent. of them are marked 'very good' or 'excellent,' and about 75 per cent. not lower than 'good.' Nearly 25 per cent. come under the head of 'fair.' In schools where there are regularly constituted infants' departments good work is also done, but in many cases the facilities for the training of infants are neither adequate nor suitable."

I also wish to give this census regarding reports on schools, taken by Revs. A. S. Woodward, Belfastian, and Dr. Eingham, Durdonald, showing the number of reductions during 1907-8 as compared with 1904-5:—

	Reports received.	Showing reduction.	Percentage.	No. showing improvement.
Presbyterian Schools.	158	74	46.8	17=20.7 per cent.
R. C. Schools.	99	47	47.4	6=6.0 "
Totals.	257	121	47.1	23=8.7 "

18700. Mr. HARRISON:—"I suppose that as you are now first of first you are not financially affected by the reduction of these merit marks?—There was no reduction in my salary."

18701. It was only your reputation as a teacher that was affected?—My reputation as a teacher.

18702. The CHAIRMAN:—"Now, in there any other document that you wish to put in?—Yes; besides that I wish to put in a statistical statement, and I hand in a copy of my record as a teacher as part of my evidence."

18708. Does that begin with "Early education received at model school"?—Yes.

I received my early education at Model School and Royal Academical Institution, Belfast. I was appointed pupil teacher in Belfast Model N.S., January, 1880—classified as a teacher of the 3rd class in April of that year—at examination for 2nd class in 1881 competed for and obtained a Model School Assistantship, and appointed assistant in Cook Model School on 1st January, 1882—transferred to Belfast Model N.S. in September, 1883, and appointed principal of present school in September, 1886—at examination in 1890 promoted to 2nd division of 1st class, and at the following year's examination promoted to 1st division of 1st class. I was certificated in drawing, vocal music, elementary science, magnetism and electricity, agriculture, hydrostatics, and hydraulics. The following are extracts from the reports and observations of the National Board's Inspectors on St. James's National School:—Year 1889.—J. MORAN, LL.D.—The teachers have faithfully discharged their respective duties during the past year. The moral tone is good; discipline and order satisfactory. 1889.—J. MORAN, LL.D.—The moral tone, order, and discipline are excellent. The school in every respect is in a very satisfactory state. 1892.—Mr. W. P. HEEDEN.—I am pleased to report that this school, judged by the results of this examination, has been conducted with creditable efficiency since last inspection. The pupils answered well in all subjects, both ordinary and extra. Any little weakness that appeared I have brought immediately under the notice of the teachers, who all seem most earnest and devoted to their work. The order of the school and general deportment of the pupils are good. 1890.—Mr. W. P. HEEDEN.—This school has been conducted with excellent efficiency during the past year. The general answering in all the obligatory subjects of the programme was highly satisfactory. Music, drawing, and algebra have also been well taught, and on the whole the work done in this school is most creditable in respect of both quality and quantity. The industrial training of the girls is also efficiently conducted, a number of creditable examples of their work was exhibited during the examination by the senior girls. The order and tone are good. 1901.—Mr. W. P. HEEDEN.—The general answering at this examination has, as usual, been excellent. All subjects have received careful attention during the year, and the teaching has been conducted with creditable efficiency in all departments. The specimens executed at the examination and the articles of wearing apparel made during the year by the senior girls and exhibited to-day afford satisfactory proof of the efficiency with which the industrial training is carried on. Vocal music also is well taught. Order and tone are good. 1899.—Mr. J. P. DALTON.—The school is carefully taught and in a high state of efficiency in every respect. A standard of excellence is maintained in the proficiency; the requirements of order and discipline are well fulfilled, and the house and premises are suitably kept. The results of the inspection altogether have been most satisfactory. 1898.—Mr. J. P. DALTON.—The school has progressed well during the past year, and the usual excellent standard of proficiency has been maintained. Order and discipline are quite satisfactory. The house and premises are in thorough repair. 1894.—Mr. J. P. DALTON.—The results of the examination have, as usual, been most satisfactory, and the school continues in a high state of efficiency. The state of order and discipline leaves nothing to be desired. The house and premises are in thorough repair. 1895.—Mr. J. P. DALTON.—The progress for the past year has, as usual, been most satisfactory, and the proficiency continues excellent in every respect. The state of order and discipline leaves nothing to be desired. The house and premises are very carefully kept. 1886.—Mr. J. P.

19th July, 1918.]

Mr. JOHN EDWARD LAMMOUR, examined.

[Continued]

Dutton.—The school work continues to be thoroughly satisfactory in all respects. The proficiency is of the usual high standard. The state of order and discipline leaves nothing to be desired and the house and grounds are very carefully kept. 1907.—Mr. J. P. Dalton.—The results of the inspection are very satisfactory, and show that the school work is being carried on with the same thoroughness and success which have marked it for several years. The requirements of order and discipline are also excellently fulfilled. The house and grounds are carefully kept. 1908.—Mr. J. P. Dalton.—The school work has been done with the usual care and thoroughness during the past year, and the excellent proficiency previously registered has been fully maintained. All the members of the staff aim at high standards in the teaching, and their efforts are attended for the most part with commendable success. The school is admirably disciplined and well-tuned in all respects. The house and grounds are carefully kept. 1909.—Mr. T. F. O'Connor.—The teachers achieved a very creditable success in the preparation of the pupils for the examination. Some weakness was shown by the first fifth class in the parsing test; but, apart from this, the answering, both oral and written, in obligatory subjects was of a very satisfactory character. The attainments of the pupils in optional and extra branches were also good. The school affords excellent disciplinary training. A renovation of the schoolrooms is desirable. The walls are discoloured and the general appearance is wanting in brightness. 1909. Mr. T. F. O'Connor.—An excellent year's progress has been made, and the state of the school as a whole reflects credit on the industry and competency of the staff. The curriculum included singing, drawing, book-keeping, and algebra in addition to the obligatory subjects of the old programme. The attainments of the pupils in all indicated intelligence and careful teaching. The discipline is very good. 1901.—Mr. J. Chambers.—Progress of pupils "excellent." The answering on the whole was very satisfactory. 1902.—Mr. W. T. Clements.—Progress of pupils "excellent." The principal teacher and his staff of assistants deserve very great credit for the able, efficient, and painstaking manner in which they have discharged their duties during the year just terminated. Insp. O.B.—The pupils are bright, intelligent, and well-conducted, and have received an excellent training in habits of attention, patient industry, and devotion to duty. On the whole excellent educational progress has been made since the last annual examination, and the school is now in a most efficient condition. I would be glad if the manager would make some structural changes to the school building, so as to facilitate the teaching and organisation of this most important school.

Nov. 1908.—Mr. D. Mangin.—Progress of pupils "excellent." Inspector's Observation Book.—There appears to be no falling off in the efficiency of the teaching nor the general proficiency of the school. Both are of a very high character indeed. The schoolroom wants doing up—brightening. Walls are getting dirty. A teacher's desk is badly wanting, and I hope it will be got as soon as possible. Another work-table would be a useful acquisition. The cut-off-table should be annually lime-washed. Lime-washing is required at present, and painting of woodwork.

1904.—Mr. P. J. Kelly.—General condition of school "very good." Inspector's Observation Book.—The result of this inspection shows that the teachers have worked assiduously and successfully during the past year. The general proficiency was very good, and an excellent tone pervades the school. Discipline was excellent and the pupils are polite and well-behaved. There are no debts in the infants' schoolroom. There is no globe and no scale map.

1905.—Mr. P. J. Kelly.—General condition of school "very good." Inspector's Observation Book.—The school maintains a creditable standard of efficiency. The proficiency was in most respects very good, and the discipline was very satisfactory. The omission of elementary science

and mathematics detracts somewhat from the educational value of the school. The woodwork needs painting and the walls have not been coloured since 1911. The infants' classroom is not well ventilated. At least two more windows should admit of being opened.

Sept. 1905.—Mr. P. J. Kelly.—Inspector's Observation Book.—Discipline in the room in which Mr. Lammour had immediate charge was excellent. The pupils were working quietly and harmoniously. The monitor has not yet written any notes of lessons, and criticism lessons have not yet been given. These factors will have to be taken into account in classifying the school. As regards painting, etc., my suggestions have not yet been carried out.

Jan. 1907.—Mr. J. Mangin.—General condition of school "good." Inspector's Observation Book.—The general proficiency in English is very good, in arithmetic and other subjects taught it is good. Discipline is excellent, and the pupils are polite. Lessons on health and habits are to be given. Criticism lessons are now given, and the monitors have the notes of the lessons they give. The walls are bare; there should be some pictures and flowers to brighten up the place. Polishing the walls is desirable. There are no facilities for teaching kindergarten nor for teaching elementary science. This is regrettable as there are members of the staff competent to give instructions in these subjects. The teaching of algebra is sound, though the pupils have not made much progress yet in the subject. Two of the assistants were absent unwell.

Inspector's remarks upon the result of the inspection of the School.—General condition of school "good." The discipline of the school and the tone are excellent.

Nov. 1907.—Mr. J. Mangin.—General condition of school "very good." Inspector's Observation Book.—"Very creditable work is done in this school, and there is evidence of recent improvement." Arithmetic is very intelligently taught throughout, but standards VI. and VII. are slow at mental calculations. The walls have recently been coloured and the woodwork varnished. The schoolhouse is now in a very good state of repair. Coloured pictures and some new maps would be an acquisition.

Nov. 1908.—Mr. W. H. Welby.—"Roll not called at 10.45." Inspector's Observation Book.—Mr. Lammour was called upstairs about some school business, he tells me, and hence the delay.

Dec. 1908.—Inspector's Observation Book.—Mr. J. A. Cole.—"The junior room is very poorly equipped."

Jan. 1909.—Inspector's Observation Book.—Mr. W. H. Welby.—"There is no modulator in the school, no scale map, no map of the British Isles, no blank map of Ireland. A good globe should be procured. The infants are also making good progress, but the equipment of their room is quite inadequate. I note Mr. Cole's remarks as to the appearance of the school-rooms."

June, 1909.—Inspector's Observation Book.—Mr. Welby.—"Clock upstairs out of order."

19104. Mr. HANMOR.—I think the best plan will be if I ask you what are the main points that you are going to make, and then you can develop those. Now, take the first?—Well, there is the matter about the Belfast deputation to Dr. Sharkey, and the replies of the aided inspectors, and I would like to go over some of the points.

19105. Will you confine yourself to those that affect you personally, or are you giving general evidence?—I would like to speak with regard to the whole of the inspectors in our group of districts, because I was one of the deputation.

19106. Are you speaking for the whole Association or only on facts that concern yourself, and of which you have personal knowledge?—I am speaking of facts that I have personal knowledge of.

19107. That is affecting the teachers. Now, what point shall we take first?—The first thing is the report

19108.—Mr. P. J. Kelly.—General condition of school "very good." Inspector's Observation Book.—The school maintains a creditable standard of efficiency. The proficiency was in most respects very good, and the discipline was very satisfactory. The omission of elementary science

19109.—Mr. P. J. Kelly.—General condition of school "very good." Inspector's Observation Book.—The school maintains a creditable standard of efficiency. The proficiency was in most respects very good, and the discipline was very satisfactory. The omission of elementary science

19110.—Mr. P. J. Kelly.—General condition of school "very good." Inspector's Observation Book.—The school maintains a creditable standard of efficiency. The proficiency was in most respects very good, and the discipline was very satisfactory. The omission of elementary science

19111.—Mr. P. J. Kelly.—General condition of school "very good." Inspector's Observation Book.—The school maintains a creditable standard of efficiency. The proficiency was in most respects very good, and the discipline was very satisfactory. The omission of elementary science

16th July, 1913.]

Mr. JOHN EDWARD LAMMOUR, examined.

[Continued.]

of the deposition at page 195 of the Appendix to the First Report of this Committee. I have a short statement here which I will hand in and it will show you the points that I refer to.

10705. This is in answer to the observations of Mr. Mangin?—It is in answer to the observations of the chief inspectors, beginning in the second column of page 186.

10706. This is in reply to the observations of the chief inspectors?—Yes. With regard to the manner in which the complaint from the teachers in the circuits around Belfast was received and treated officially, I would point out that the official tone and temper is clearly and honestly stated at page 197 of the Appendix to the First Report of the present Vice-Royal Commission as follows:—"The growing intolerance of authority, so noticeable nowadays in all classes of students, probably has a good deal to do with the present movement." The end of the paragraph in which these words occur leads me to infer why it was unnecessary to issue any circulars from the Education Office directing inspectors to raise the standard of their requirements. When one inspector was removed to an uncomfortable circuit, because his justice in awarding "merit marks" caused too great a drain on the inadequate sum in the hands of the Commissioners, and available for distribution under the head of increments, many others would take care to avoid his mistake. The chief inspectors are mistaken when they assume that the teachers about Belfast "arranged" the inspectors. The teachers simply complained that they were not receiving justice and they believe their complaint to be well founded. The census taken by the Rev. Woodward and Dr. Bingham, which is so complete as volunteers could possibly make it, amply vindicates the position taken up by the teachers. We do not claim that inspectors should be infallible or that inspection should become an exact science, but we think if one inspector is made uncomfortable because he makes the mistake of overlooking one of the thousands of points which he should notice, and thereby becomes a teacher, another who makes a mistake which penalises a teacher should be visited with the same severity as his erring brother. The letter of 14th November, 1910, and reply, in the Belfast Teachers' Association pamphlet entitled "Inspection and Reports on National Schools" further reveals the official mind in the attitude taken up in regard to teachers. I have a copy* of this document. This further reveals the official mind in the attitude taken up in regard to teachers. These teachers are not to know for three years at a stretch whether the authority exercised over them is favorable or otherwise, and consequently in the growth of the civil plant intolerance will be delayed, which is the next most desirable issue to entire prevention. The two chief inspectors were present at the interview of the Belfast deputation with Dr. Sturges, and consequently knew that the teachers present made no statement such as was ascribed to them, that Irish favourable school reports generally had risen by 8 per cent., while the Belfast ones had gone down 23 per cent. I will read you the concluding part of Mr. Wyse's letter of 17/3/11 in the Belfast Teachers' pamphlet† in reply to Mr. Knight, in which he says: "I am inclined to think that names of the speakers on behalf of the deputation have not been correctly given in all cases, and that the report of Mr. Lammour's opening statement is not altogether accurate. You and your friends will probably be able to make any correction that may be necessary on those points." Now, we made these corrections, and when we made the corrections they were put in the footnote, notwithstanding that the Chief Inspectors were present at the time the figures were quoted and notwithstanding that Dr. Sturges had a copy of the figures before him, and was following up closely the statements that were made. The chief inspectors in this reply of theirs in your Appendix at page 195 point out in the second paragraph of it at the very end, "and finally they handled statistics in such a way as to make them quite unreliable." Now, we did not handle statistics in any way except to present them in the way they were in the Board's Blue Book. We did not attempt

to manipulate those figures in any way. We exactly gave them as they were there, and if you like you can contrast them with how the chief inspectors managed the figures, and you will see the way they take up a scale of points and award points for "excellent," "very good," "good," "fair," "satisfactory," and "bad." I would call that a manipulation. My point is this. You see that it ascribed to us that we made a mistake which on further computation we corrected, but what I wish to contend now is that we made no mistake, and whenever a mistake was made it was not with us.

10710. The CHAIRMAN.—That is in putting 8 per cent. instead of 4 per cent.?—Yes; but I can prove that the error might have happened somewhere else. Mr. Wyse in his letter says he believes that the opening statement of one member of the deputation (that is myself) was not accurately given, and that he knew that in other cases there was inaccuracy. I contend that Mr. Wyse admits that it was possible, and as a matter of fact, in another part of the evidence that I can adduce contained in your Blue Book, viz., pages 174 and 181-2, I give the actual figures, 78 per cent. and 74 per cent., and I give the figures for all Ireland, and it was utterly impossible for me to use the number 8 or the number 15.

10711. You gave those figures at the time?—Yes, I did, at the time, and therefore it was impossible that I could have said that Irish favourable reports generally had risen by 8 per cent., while the Belfast ones had gone down 23 per cent. Mr. Wyse's letter of 17/3/11 in the Belfast National Teachers' pamphlet proves that inaccuracies were possible in the verification report of the deputation to Dr. Sturges, and others than those can be pointed out. For example, on page 194 of the Appendix to the report of this Committee where Mr. Walsby writes to me the insanity of thinking that "An inspector ought to be able to find out in 10 minutes what kind a school is." There is a footnote on page 173 correcting what appears above. You see that in the middle of second column on 174 he says: "Mr. Lammour thinks an inspector ought to be able to find out in 10 minutes what kind a school is." Now if you turn back to 173 you will see in the verification report of the deputation in the paragraph occupying the middle of the first column, "But we are of opinion that an efficient inspector should be a man who could walk into a school and find out in 10 minutes what kind the school is." Now, the footnote there is: "The members of the deputation have since intimated that what was intended was 'and find out what kind the school is, but not in 10 minutes as one inspector could be said.'" We contend again, with regard to that, that that was not a sufficiently satisfactory correction. It was I who made the statement, and I have an idea of what I wanted to say, and I could not possibly say what is ascribed to me above.

10712. Mr. HARRISON.—May we take it that you never used the words "in 10 minutes"?—Oh, yes, I used those words. You see them down below in the footnote, but not in 10 minutes as one of the inspectors said he could.

10713. Now, will you go on to the next point, because the more concise these things are the more effective they will be?—I wish to be as concise as possible.

10714. What is the next point?—I wanted to speak with regard to my school outside the general question of the schools of the district—what had happened in the case of my school in reference to the observations of Mr. Mangin. I think an impartial reader of the notes on St. James's National School in the years 1906-7 would conclude that the appearance of the schoolroom played a very important part in the award of merit marks to the school. Personally, I am convinced that it was the chief factor, as I have stated in the Rejoinder to the Inspectors' Observations. Many of the comments on the work in my school were quite unknown to me. Mr. D. Mangin, for instance, says in March, 1911, in his reply to the teachers that he finds in his notes on the general inspection of my school in 1907 that the oral composition of the infants was weak. My note on that is that there was no mention of this

* Vide Appendix XLV.

† Vide Appendix XLVI.

18th July, 1913.]

Mr. JOHN EDWARD LAMBERT, examined.

[Continued.]

for the teacher's information by the inspector. Then he says: "(b) Arithmetic in the standard above the 4th and needlework in all the standards only very fair." In the school report Mr. Mangon says: "Drawing and needlework in the senior standards will require somewhat closer attention." Then he says: "(c) Drawing was only middling in the standards above the first, and no scale drawing was taught to the senior standards." In the observation book he says: "The general proficiency in English is very good, and in arithmetic and other subjects taught is good."

16715. Are you sure that that applies in the observation book to the result of the same visit?—Oh, yes; it is the same visit.

16716. Any other point?—Well, with regard to kindergarten it is said I did not draw on the blackboard. I used to draw from sheets of paper which some years previously had been insisted on by inspectors in all schools round about. They found fault with me for not having these large drawing sheets, and now they expect drawing on the blackboard. I am speaking of fresh drawing. They expect the teachers to draw on the blackboard.

16717. Mr. HENLEY.—Was there any note on that in the observation book?—The note that you see in the appendix, p. 155, is: "Drawing from the blackboard was the exception rather than the rule," and I make no comment on that; it is quite correct that I did not teach fresh drawing by drawing copies on the blackboard. I used the blackboard to correct wrong drawing. Then he says in his reply: "No kindergarten had been taught, though there were over 100 pupils enrolled in the 1st standard," and "practically no elementary science had been taught." In the observation book the remark is that there are no facilities for teaching kindergarten or elementary science. Then he says: "There are members of the staff competent to instruct in this subject." My point with regard to that is that these in Appendix, p. 155, are the observations made by Mr. Mangon for the information of the Commissioners in "Observations" made by the inspectors in reply to the teachers, and this note was actually what was written in the observation book in the school with regard to these matters, and he brings up matters there that you will see that the teacher had no notice of whatever at the time.

16718. Mr. HARRISON.—What is your objection to (c) and (f)?—My objection to (c) and (f) is that it should have stated when he was giving this to the Commissioners, that there was no facilities for doing it. He leaves it so to be inferred in (c) and (f) that it was owing to my incompetency or disinclination to take up the subject.

16719. What does he mean by "there are no facilities"?—That means that there was no apparatus, that there was no science table, that there were no kindergarten desks, nor a table for kindergarten objects, nothing whatever to teach kindergarten with. It was impossible for a teacher to teach kindergarten or elementary science. There was no apparatus of any kind.

16720. Had there not been some grant towards apparatus for teaching elementary science?—Yes, but our school got none.

16721. Why not? Was it because it did not apply for any?—No, I think it was owing to the fact that the Commissioners in the early times (I can only surmise this from what some teachers told me) only made grants to the poorer schools.

16722. And yours was not regarded as poor?—Ours was not regarded as a poor school.

16723. You say it had absolutely no income, or that the income was only just sufficient to keep it going?—Yes.

16724. It was an extremely well-to-do district?—It was formerly, but all the people who formerly attended our congregation, the wealthier people, have gone to St. Peter's, higher up the Antrim Road.

16725. They are still living near?—But they do not attend our Church, and we have not their money.

16726. That is your reply to Mr. Mangon?—Yes. I wish to put in, in my evidence, what I have already

said in the Repinders of the teachers. In order to save time I would wish to bring it before you now.

16727. That is "Mr. Lambert's Reply"?—I wish to put that in as part of my evidence to save time. While I do not regard the inspectors' criticism of the seven members of the deputation in charge of the memorial from Belfast circuits as in any sense a reply to the statements made in the memorial or by the deputationists, I do not think this criticism should pass without notice. Many of the comments now made on the work in my school are quite new to me. Although Mr. Mangon now says:

"The oral composition of the infants was weak," neither at the time of his visit (January, 1907) nor in his minute afterwards received, did he make, for the teachers' guidance, any reference to this alleged defect. Again he now says: "Arithmetic in the standards above the 4th, and needlework in all the standards were only very fair," but at his inspection he wrote, "The general proficiency in English is very good. In arithmetic and the other subjects taught it is good." Further, he says: "Practically no elementary science had been taught," but in the observation book he wrote: "There are no facilities for teaching kindergarten, nor for teaching elementary science." With regard to Mr. Mangon's further observation, I beg to reiterate what I have already said in the Teachers' Repinders.* Neither Mr. Welby nor Mr. Kelly, when referring to the drawing of the junior infants on slates instead of paper, informed the Commissioners in March, 1911, that there were no junior infants' desks, and therefore the change to paper work could not be carried out. I am referring now to the Inspectors' Observations. In addition to the points brought out by Mr. Welby, and mentioned by me in the Teachers' Repinders, there is a note made by him in the observation book on his visit on the 6th of April, 1908. It runs: "The fourth year monitor's teaching of second reading to-day was very unskillful." The monitor he referred to there must be the one who was in her last year but one, namely the second year, of her three years' course. He further compared this monitor to one in her first year, and wished to know why the former was less skilful than the latter. I replied that the former was an intermediate school pupil, while the latter was the product of the National school. He did not see why the difference in experience should make this marked difference in skill, in other words that a person who had experience as a pupil for 8 years in a National school should understand and be able to practise its methods of teaching much better than a pupil from an intermediate school where there are no trained teachers, and after the latter person had seen National school methods for only two years. It is little wonder that clever men of great scholarship like Mr. Welby never attempt to exemplify how a teacher should treat a subject when they condemn methods they find in use. Not having received adequate training in the education of young people, they might well fear to have their own ideas of the proper treatment of any subject canvassed by earnest trained men and women of long experience. I contend that gentlemen like Mr. Welby coming into a school do not sympathise very much apparently with the elementary school teachers, owing to the fact, I presume, that they do not know the difficulties. Now, I contend that that instance that happened in my own school showed to a large extent why it was that Mr. Welby would not sympathise with the teachers. He thought that this teacher from an intermediate school, this junior teacher who would be fully qualified to become an assistant in a National school in another year, ought to be a better teacher than an ordinary monitor who had four years still to go before she would be called a qualified teacher and who had seen some eight years of the teaching of National schools, and who had had experience of it as a pupil. There is only one other piece of evidence with regard to what happened in my school that I wish to put in in addition to what I have already been agreed should be published in the Appendix, that is the statements made by inspectors with regard to the equipment of the school and the appearance of the school walls. It is essential that that should be part of my evidence, because it proves my contention I think that the inspectors were thinking very largely of the appearance of the school, and of the premises, and this is further evidence on the

16th July, 1918.]

Mr. JOHN EDWARD LARMOUR, examined.

[Continued.]

same point. Mr. Kelly, the inspector of the school, writes on the 13th of November, 1911, to the present manager of the school, Mr. Collins, and he says "It so happened that I called at St. James's School and discussed with the staff the question of introducing cookery under a guarantee that if the equipment is provided other objections will vanish. The proper person to teach this subject is Miss Larmour. Firstly, she is the best qualified, and secondly, when the infants are dismissed at 1.30 she will be free to do it in the days work." Now, that is a mis-statement. The infants are not dismissed at 1.30. It is only the junior infants who are dismissed at 1.30, and Miss Larmour would not be free to take up that work at 1.30 owing to the fact that she still had the senior infants, and had to teach drawing and writing, and she had one half of the needlework of the school, and she could not very well teach needlework, and either drawing or writing, at the same time that she was teaching cookery.

16728. The CHAIRMAN.—Had the inspector made the suggestion to you personally that Miss Larmour should do this?—No, he had not.

16729. Mr. HARRISON.—He said he discussed with the staff. I presume that means that he discussed with you?—No, he was not with me; he did not discuss with me this question of dismissing the infants, was never discussed with me.

16730. Well, did he discuss the question of cookery with you?—Not with me. He may have done it, but not with me. My sister told me that he spoke to her.

16731. But you have no recollection that he discussed it with you?—I am perfectly convinced that I never had a discussion with him about it.

16732. Then "discussed with the staff" means "discussed with Miss Larmour"?—It must mean that.

16733. But surely the question of introducing a new subject ought to have been discussed with the principal?—I should think so. "There is no reason whatever why two assistants should have charge of one cookery class; in fact such an arrangement would be absurd." This refers to some suggestion of my sister that some one should be associated with her in teaching cookery, as she did not think it would be fair that she should have the whole of it to do. You see this is fairly clear, in my recollection of what took place with regard to that, because it was only through my sister that I learned anything about it.

16734. And that evidently referred I presume to Miss Larmour?—Yes. "The infant room is quite suitable, and if tables are required trestle tables would probably be the best, because they could be put aside when not required." I wish to say with regard to that, that more than half the room is taken up with the infants' desks, and I do not think that these infants' desks would be suitable for senior girls, who are learning cookery, to sit. Further, there is very little space in the infants' room left for these tables to be put in, and there should be a press to hold cookery requisites. They have a press to hold some china ware used for afternoon meetings, and they have an organ case to hold the organ that is used in Sunday School in the place, and a gas stove would have to be erected, so that I do not think that it would be at all a suitable room, and I do not think any people at all who know anything about cookery arrangements, and where girls go to see demonstrations, would think it was a proper one; so that as regards the time of teaching the subject and the freedom of Miss Larmour, and as to the suitability of the room, on these three points I contend that Mr. Kelly is not correct. The next point is the fees. "They were intended primarily to cover the cost of equipment, not as a perquisite for the teachers." I am very anxious that that statement should go into the evidence.

16735. Did you understand it in that way?—Yes, I understood that if the teacher taught any extra subject like Irish or mathematics, or cookery or handiwork, the teacher should get the fee for teaching as a reward for the extra trouble.

16736. From what fund would the equipment come?—The equipment would come from the same fund as any other part of the equipment of the school. This was the great trouble.

16737. You understand that if cookery were introduced into the school it would be the manager's business to supply the equipment?—Logically the manager would supply all the equipment of the school, unless the National Board undertook to do it.

16738. And you know of no justification for that remark of Mr. Kelly's?—I know of none whatever. "There may not be much available for distribution among the staff for the first year, but in subsequent years the case would be different. The house which supplies the equipment may be willing to give, say, six months' credit at 5 per cent." There is only one other point with regard to my school that I wish to mention, and that is where in your appendix Mr. Kelly's observations are given on my school in page 185, second column. Mr. Kelly mentions quite a number of things in connection with my school there as things that had been noted in the Observational Book.

16739. Mr. HARRISON.—Will you look at Rule 190, clause 6?—I would not take it that that meant equipment. I do not think that equipment is incidental because it won't happen every year. You won't require to equip a cookery class every year.

16740. Mr. HARRISON.—You say R. 120, section 6, does not apply to the preliminary expenses?—The preliminary expenses of providing a gas stove and cookery table.

16741. That is a matter that we need not discuss. By the way, there is a point that appears to come in here, and that is how far the merit marks were affected by the state of the buildings?—I take it that whenever cookery and elementary science and other subjects like that were not introduced the inspectors considered the school was not an efficient one, that the schools were inefficient to the extent that they had not introduced them.

16742. Let us keep to one thing, and not mix up elementary science with dirty walls. You see, Mr. Mangin makes the observation, "The dirty walls had nothing at all to do with the mark I gave; I do not think Mr. Larmour himself seriously believes they had." I thought you wanted to comment on that?—Mr. Mangin writes, "The dirty walls had nothing whatever to do with it." My opinion is derived from what he wrote in November, 1903. It is on this that I hand to the Secretary here. He wrote in 1903, "The schoolroom needs doing up, brightening. Walls are getting dirty"; and in January, 1907, that is little over three years afterwards, he writes, without the walls receiving attention of painters in the meantime, "Walls require to be painted and some pictures should be got to brighten up the room." My comment is, how can he seriously think that I do not believe that the walls had to do with the mark that he gave in face of his observation? Mr. Mangin suggests further on that "The mark would probably have been higher if the principal had made an honest effort to teach in the spirit of the new system rather than follow that of the old." He probably does not know that I devoted time and see at Belfast Technical Institute to improve myself in those branches of drawing which had been neglected during my training under the supervision of the National Board's Officers, and this occurred before the Board made a move to help teachers in the new system. When the Board did start classes in "Hand and Eye" and elementary science I attended them also. These facts enable me to set a correct value on Mr. Mangin's opinion that my "own attitude towards it (the new system) seemed to be that of a passive resistor." If Mr. Mangin held the views he now expresses why did he not condemn my attitude and set me right in November, 1905, or January, 1907, instead of reporting, as he did in the latter year, that the "discipline of the school and the tone are excellent."

16743. That is your reply to that charge?—That is my reply.

16744. Have you any other point?—The only other point is that Mr. Kelly on page 185, second column, half way down, states a number of things such as "neglecting to record the time of arrival or departure before the 4th of November, 1906." Well, with regard to that, he came into my school and he asked me why I had not recorded the time, and I said to

12th July, 1913.]

Mr. JOHN EDWARD HARRISON, examined.

[Continued.]

him that I had not received any book from the Commissioner in which to record the time. He said, "Could you not put it in the Roll Book?" I said, "I do not see any place in the Roll Book to record the time. I have kept the teachers' attendance in the Roll Book in the way in which we record the pupils' attendance with the 'absent' and 'present' marks. That is all that we have been accustomed to do or been asked to do by inspectors previously"; and he said, "Why don't you obey the instructions you got?" and I said, "What instructions?" and he said, "Didn't you get a paper from me about entering the time?" I said, "I believe that I have a paper that I got from you with regard to entering the time, but on that paper there was nothing in the shape of instruction." It wound up by saying, "It is advisable that teachers should enter their time at entering and departing from the school," and I pointed this out to him, that I did not consider that that was an instruction. In any case I said I was waiting to get a book from the Board, and he said, "You must be very innocent," and I said, "I don't think I am very innocent with regard to that, because I was in the model school service and they have a book to enter the time of the teachers there, and when I got this paper from you saying that it was advisable for teachers to enter the time I presumed that the Commissioners would send down a book similar to that used in the model schools."

16743. And may I take it that there is no official time book?—There is no official time book.

16744. And is there anything in the regulations providing that there should be one?—It says, teachers should enter their time, but it does not say whether the teachers are to enter it on a slip of paper or in a book.

16745. But it is in the regulations that you are expected to enter it?—Oh, yes, quite recently it came out, and I wish to say that I have done it from the time that Mr. Kelly called on the 4th of November. I said, "How would you like the thing done, Mr. Kelly; if you instruct me how you wish it done I think I can do it?" (The Witness here explained the method suggested by Mr. Kelly, and adopted by him, of entering the times of arrival and departure.)

16746. The CHAIRMAN.—You did that even before the interview?—Immediately after Mr. Kelly instructed me to do it I did so.

16747. Mr. HARRISON.—But still before Mr. Kelly's instruction to you it was in the regulations?—It was in the regulations, but there was no book in which to do it.

16748. The CHAIRMAN.—You are keeping this time now?—Oh, yes, I am.

16749. And have you got a book from the Commissioner?—No; I did it in accordance with the instructions Mr. Kelly gave me. Mr. Kelly instructed me to do it in the Roll Book of children's attendance, and if you saw a sample of it you would understand that it is not a satisfactory matter and that there is no space to put in, say, these figures, and the result is that one day's attendance is on the top of another day's attendance.

16750. Mr. HARRISON.—It might have been kept on a sheet of foolscap?—Oh, yes, it might have been.

16751. But in this case he is technically right in saying that you did not do that?—I am not sure that it was in the regulations at that time.

16752. At any rate it is a very small point?—The only other point that I wish to refer to is that I asked Mr. Kelly a question in the course of the deputation to the Resident Commissioner—"I wish to direct your attention to one of the complaints made by Mr. Kelly against my teaching, that I did not do a sufficient amount of the school work." You will find that on page 185, about the 4th or 5th paragraph. I had requested the Resident Commissioner, Dr. Starke, to allow me to put the question. I said to Dr. Starke, "I will get it through you, and you can decide." I asked Mr. Kelly did he decide in my school that an assistant should have charge mainly of the 3rd and 4th standards, that another assistant, Miss Brown, should have charge of the 5th standard, and

all the writing of the 1st and reading of the 2nd to be under my care while I had charge of the 6th and 7th standards, in October, 1906." To that Mr. Kelly said, "I cannot answer that question without referring to my notes. If I could answer all those questions without referring to my notes about every school I visited I should have a prodigious memory."

16753. You were asking about occurrence of five years before?—Yes, but I wish to say with regard to that, that in his reply to the teachers after that deputation he was pointing out to the Commissioners that I had not done my work properly, and he continued to make that statement, and I have documentary proof in my bag here of my sending forward to Mr. Kelly a copy of my time table at that time. The time table was exactly as he had fixed it in October, 1906. His reply to me finally on the 1st of November, 1906, was, "You may inform the manager."

16754. You are going into something to which there is no reference in this paper. This is extraneous matter?—He refers to this matter.

16755. Where does he refer to it?—You see the ninth charge on page 185, where he speaks of defective organisation in my school. The point about or germane that Mr. Kelly made was that I had only taken the 6th and 7th standards and that I had given the two assistants in my school from the 1st up to the 5th standard. I am addressing now, in proof that that was inaccurate on his part, the fact that I practically had the same time table that had been in use so far as division of the work amongst the staff was concerned, the same that he had authorised in October, 1906, and I have the document here that he sent me in reply to the time table that I forwarded to him at that time.

16756. Are you following the time table that he had approved or practically approved?—So far as organisation is concerned. Organisation means the number of classes that each teacher has and they amount of work they have and how it is divided up, and I was following that exactly.

16757. Mr. HARRY.—Was the number of pupils in the class approximately the same?—Approximately the same; it was some 30 at the time under my care, at the time that he approved of the time table, and there were 17 at the time that he found fault with me.

16758. Then you are certain that the defective organisation that he mentions referred to that, because it is stated here in general terms?—Oh, yes, that is what was referred to.

16759. Did he call your attention to any case of defective organisation apart from that distribution of the work amongst the staff?—It was not until the Commissioners' publication came out with the observations of the inspectors that I know that there was any fault found.

16760. There was no fault found with it until it was found in these observations?—He had mentioned it in the minute that came down from the Board, and I had spoken to him previously about it. I have pointed out to him that he had severely done me justice.

16761. But are you quite sure that the defective organisation only referred to the distribution of the pupils amongst the staff?—That is all he spoke to me about. He did not introduce the matter to me. At a subsequent visit I brought the matter up. I said, "In the Minute that has come down from the Board you state, Mr. Kelly, that I am only teaching the 6th and 7th standards and the two assistants in the school have from the 1st up to the 5th," so that I introduced the subject to him at a subsequent visit; and he then said, "Well, what do you complain of?" and I said, "I complain of the fact that it is I who have charge of the 1st and 2nd standards with the exception of two half hours for each teacher per day, that they teach reading in one half hour and arithmetic in one half hour to the junior standard; and that during the rest of the time they are in the hands of a monitor under my supervision, and I am wholly responsible for them."

18th, July, 1913.]

Mr. JOHN EDWARD LARMOUR, Chairman.

[Continued.]

16764. You are aware, of course, that latterly the measures have been insisting on what they call the double tripartite and double bipartite system. Had it any reference to any regulation of that kind?—Oh, no, none whatever. It had reference to the fact that he considered that I was giving the assistants too much work to do, and I presumed that it was through a misapprehension on his part, and I explained to him at this visit that I had charge of the lot and set standards with the help of a secretary. With the exception of two half hours for each teacher per day they were under my charge.

16765. And that referred to nothing else?—When I brought the matter up he did not say that the question referred to something else. If I had been mistaken in thinking that he had referred to that he would have pointed it out to me.

16766. Mr. HARRISON.—Then we may take it that that is your interpretation of what he means by defective organisation and that we are now having your answer to that?—That is so.

16767. The next point is about written exercises. The statement is that they were carelessly executed, carelessly marked or not marked at all?—He found a number of defective exercises that had not been carefully marked, and I think he found two of them that had not been marked at all whatever way they had escaped.

16768. In your class or that of one of your assistants?—Oh, in my own class it was.

16769. He brought it under your notice, I presume?—Yes, at the time; I am not objecting to that; I am not saying he was wrong in finding fault with that, but I wish to point out that I have sometimes to leave my class and go up to give assistance to some of my teachers in my own school and to leave practically my class to do some work themselves during the time I am away. The inspectors at the present insist on the principal teacher working portion of the school as well as having supervision of the classes. Even in very large schools they are insisting on it, and, of course, if the principal is away from his class there is a likelihood of something going wrong in his absence.

16770. The next thing is that "The teaching of Algebra and Geometry was only a make-believe."—My answer is that under the new impressionistic system it is impossible to teach a great amount of Algebra or Geometry or Arithmetic and to have the children able to thoroughly understand these things and to explain them and to have the pupils as well up in the practical work of the mathematical subjects. I say it cannot be done. Mr. Welby, in my school, pointed out that I was wrong in only having two half hours for one of these mathematical subjects in the week. He said that two half hours would not be sufficient for the purpose. I explained that it had been sufficient under the results' system when we were earning results from teaching Algebra and teaching Geometry.

16771. And certain definite tests were applied in those days?—Yes.

16772. And you knew that you would have certain definite tests applied?—In those days what you were expected to do was to do a certain amount of memorisation.

16773. How long did you give to Geometry in the week?—I gave two half hours.

16774. Apart from Algebra?—Apart from Algebra. Under the results' system I have given the same. Mr. Welby said two half hours would not be sufficient; that the work could not be done in two half hours.

16775. That is not Mr. Welby, but Mr. Kelly?—Mr. Kelly refers to that, but Mr. Welby refers to it also.

16776. May we pass on to the statement, "Mr. Larmour made no effort to brighten the rooms with pictures or plants"?—That is quite correct. The reason why I did not do anything in the way of brightening the rooms with pictures or plants is that we have a section of the Boys' Brigade in our school at night, and the boys, before those in charge of them arrive at the school, play football in the room. That is one of the reasons why maps were not suspended in the school. We could not have pictures or plants in the school or maps suspended in consequence of this.

16777. Who allows the use of the schoolroom for that purpose?—The manager.

16778. And did you protest?—I have pointed out to him that they are wrecking the furniture and dragging the desks into another room and dragging them across the floor, and the result is that they are very rickety.

16779. And the manager pays no attention?—He says that he does not like to interfere, and that the Boys' Brigade is doing good work, and he does not like the idea of having it stopped.

16780. In a matter of this sort is there not an appeal to the National Board?—Not that I am aware of, and I pointed out to him the injury that they did to me with regard to the writing and drawing. I said, "You see the state of the equipment of the school and the state of the desks, that the desks are quite shaky, and that it is impossible to get anything like fair writing or drawing done on them."

16781. Your answer to that is to point out the conditions under which you were obliged to work.

16782. The Biscuit or Ross.—Would it be possible to keep the door locked till someone in charge of the Boys' Brigade arrived on the scene, and that the key should be handed over to the person in charge?—I believe it would be quite feasible, but it is not done. The key is given to the caretaker, and some key calls for it and the door is opened half an hour before the time.

16783. Do the windows get broken with football?—They get broken with pebbles often at Sunday school and Band of Hope meetings. There are more windows broken, I think, on the Band of Hope nights than on any other nights.

16784. Mr. HENLY.—Whether is your school vested or non-vested?—It is non-vested.

16785. So that the manager has absolute control?—Yes.

16786. Mr. HARRISON.—I do not think we need go into the next paragraph at the end. You have already mentioned about kindergarten, elementary science, and cookery. Now, there is one more point—"Nor was drill taught above the first standard."—Well, that is quite correct. There is no drill because I have not been trained in drill.

16787. And none of your assistants?—None of the assistants had been trained in it, but we managed to make ourselves proficient afterwards.

16788. You were a little bit behindhand in starting drill, were you not?—I do not think so. When the Commissioners were getting up classes in science and in "Head and Eye" training and in drawing and that kind of thing, and in cookery, I think it was a very natural thing for the Commissioners to start all these things, but the big mistake that I think they have made is this—

16789. Did they not start classes in drill?—No.

16790. In fact it was to be left to voluntary effort?—Voluntary effort on the part of the teachers; and that is the reason why this was irregular. There is no regular system. Some teachers are teaching drill one way and others teaching another way.

16791. The CHAIRMAN.—Is there anything recommended to the teacher about preparing himself in order to teach this subject?—There was not at that time, the time of this complaint.

16792. There is one other question I wanted to ask you. I find that in one of these documents you bear testimony to the courtesy of the inspectors?—No, I do not think I do, but I am quite willing to do it now if you wish.

16793. I have it down here, but I may be mistaken as to the person who said it. Have you any complaint to make?—My experience of the inspectors has been that they are courteous, taking them all round. Occasionally I have seen some profusion and some impatience, but I have no complaint to make on that ground. As a rule I have found them courteous. Mr. Welby was courteous enough, but the only thing about him was that he was rather an icicle that tended to freeze me. Occasionally we have had reason to complain, but I can only remember one instance of an inspector who was coarse in my school to either a member of the staff or the pupils. The poor man is deceased now.

1915 July, 1918.]

Mr. JOHN EDWARD LAMMOUR, examined.

[Continued]

10784. Have you brought before us all the points you wish to bring?—Yes.

10785. As regards the depression of your professional reputation?—Yes, I believe so.

10786. Mr. HENRY.—Now, in the observations, I think, of Mr. Kelly he uses these words:—"When pupils are allowed to write careless exercises, when such exercises are carelessly marked or not marked at all, when there was a pretence made of teaching Algebra and Geometry, and when the pupils' eyes were allowed to rest on walls and window sills which repelled by their bareness, the atmosphere of the school was such that I could hardly commend its tone." Now, from that statement did you understand that the character of the building was taken into consideration in marking the tone of your school?—I did, certainly.

10787. That it was taken into account in an adverse sense?—Certainly; he says that he could not commend the tone of the school under these circumstances; that when he saw the pupils' eyes resting on bare walls and window sills that were devoid of plants he could not under those circumstances commend the tone of the school.

10788. And then he goes on to use these words, "The atmosphere of the school was such." In what way was the atmosphere of the school affected by the bareness of the walls?—I could not tell you exactly. I can only conjecture that the pupils' aesthetic sense was not sufficiently cultivated.

10789. Mr. KERRIS.—Do you understand what it means, because I don't?—All I can tell you is in my reply. I don't know whether you noticed it in my reply or not.

10790. Mr. HENRY.—It is brought in again here that kindergarten and elementary science and cookery are not taught, although as you say there was no opportunity for you to teach them?—Yes; that is the point that I have been making here and in my reply given in those "Rejoinders"; but I wanted to try to save time by not going over them again because I understood that these had been handled in and had been accepted.

10801. Now, in page 194 Mr. Welply says, "On the 30th of April, 1908, I visited to test progress in Algebra and Geometry. The pupils knew practically nothing of Algebra." Now, how did Mr. Welply find out whether they knew anything about it or not?—He gave them a few questions.

10802. Were they fair?—I should say that the pupils were not then up in Algebra.

10803. The 30th of April was well on in the school year?—Well, it was within two months of the end of the school year. There are ten months of the working and there were two months still to go.

10804. And how was it that they were not well up?—I really could not say at this date. You see I have not referred to that at all. I am prepared to let that go by the board.

10805. Then he says, "I found the accounts unmarked at 10.45 o'clock."—Yes; well I pointed out in what I have handed in here that he did not explain to the Commissioners when he was saying that, that he had written in the Observation Book that "Mr. Lammour explained to me that he had to go upstairs in order to settle a school matter, and was unable to get back to the lower room." We have three rooms in my school, and if there is anything that occurs in one of the other rooms I have to leave my room to go up to help any of the teachers in any way in regard to any of the children, and my class is sitting there doing work by themselves.

10806. Now, Mr. Mangan says, "When I arrived at the school on the morning of the inspection and for a little afterwards there was such a want of earnestness, much apathy, and such an absence of the spirit of work apparent that I feared for the general condition of the school, and it was this, and not the 'dirty walls,' that I had in my mind when the conversation alluded to by Mr. Lammour took place."—Mr. Mangan does not say there that there were two teachers absent from the school that day, and that was the reason that there was a lack of the spirit of work about the school. In the Observation Book he

has a remark which I have handed in there that two of the teachers were absent, all.

10807. And then further on he attributes the want of tone partly to the absence of friendly relations between the principal and one of his assistants?—There was a lady in the school who was very anxious to become the principal owing to the fact that she was going on to her pension, and she had almost had the matter arranged that she should get the principalship of the school and that the boys should be dismissed from the school and that it should be converted into a girls' school, and that is what he is referring to as to the friction between the assistant and myself.

10808. And he says here that you did not make an honest effort to teach in the spirit of the new system?—I have replied to that already that as a teacher over 40 years of age I went to a drawing class before the Commissioners started anything whatever. I should not have had to do it. The Commissioners, if they wanted efficient teachers, should have provided proper means. I had to go and serve an apprenticeship to drawing at over 40 years of age in order to fulfil the requirements of the Commissioners, and I consider that that was not showing a spirit of passive resistance. Further, when the new system came in I had some assistant teachers approaching the pensionable age, and those teachers knew practically nothing about the proper way of introducing the later system of teaching reading or teaching analysis, and after school hours I took these members of my school staff and gave them hints as to how these matters were to be introduced, and I had to rule out my blackboards in the later system to give them a good idea how to introduce these matters.

10809. So that your answer is that you went to very great trouble in preparation, and that you trained other members of your staff?—I got books on these matters with regard to drawing and object lessons and anything else that I was not thoroughly acquainted with, and I presume that there are not 30 teachers in all Ireland that have got as many books as I have on these subjects, and I can show them in my house, and all of them were got after the new system had come in.

10810. Mr. KAVANAGH.—We have had some evidence about the overcrowding of schools in Belfast. Is yours overcrowded?—Oh, mine is not at all overcrowded. I have plenty of room; I could accommodate 40 more children than I have at present.

10811. The CHAIRMAN.—You have 140?—I have slightly over 140, and I could accommodate slightly over 200 at 18 square feet.

10812. Then the mark was not reduced on account of overcrowding?—Oh, no.

10813. You attribute the lowering of the mark to the building defects in the school?—Mainly the equipment. The building is a good substantial building, but it looked rather dingy because it had not been repaired or painted or coloured in any way for five or six years, and in the evidence that I have handed in with regard to the repairs of my school it is pointed out three years after year. If you wish I will read extracts from year to year from the reports, but I thought by handing it in it would be taken as part of my evidence and would save time.

10814. Who is the manager?—The present manager is the Rev. T. G. Collins.

10815. Who is the owner of the school premises?—The members of the congregation.

10816. And have you made any representation to him that your salary might have been reduced on account of the defective equipment of the school?—When he spoke to me and said that he would like that we should get a better report on our school than "Well, it is very difficult under the circumstances," and I pointed out these things, and he has been doing his best to get equipment. He got some new desks in and he got some new maps in since these unfavourable reports have been made on the school, and he has got kindergarten desks in the infants' school; he has got a press and a table for cookery, and he has made all arrangements for these things to be introduced. He also made application to the Commissioners for elementary science to be given; and in the evidence that I have given in I want you to notice that Mr. Foster

26th July, 1935.]

MR. JOHN EDWARD LAMMOCH, examined.

[Continued.]

raised the report on my school, and it was mainly, I believe, due to the fact that the year that he came the school had been newly coloured and painted.

16617. It is well to have that brought out. It is fair to the manager?—Yes.

16618. The Bazaar or Ross.—Cookery has been introduced?—Cookery has not been introduced yet, my lord, but it is being introduced.

16619. The equipment has been procured?—Yes.

16620. Mr. KAVANAGH.—He allows football in the school?—Well, he finds it very difficult to prevent it. 16621. Why?—Unless he would come down to superintend it himself. He does not like to chase those boys out altogether.

16622. The Chairman.—What is the good of putting in these new desks if you have these youngsters playing there?—I am afraid that the desks will suffer?—I should point out that one of the reasons that he does not like to interfere is that these young men who run this organization of the Boys' Brigade are voluntary workers, and he does not like to cool their enthusiasm.

16623. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Still you can quite imagine that an inspector seeing dirty walls in the school could not give the same mark to it as to a bright, cheery, well-kept school?—Well, you see that it is stated in the circular that inspectors are to take unfavourable circumstances into account where they might be detrimental to the teacher, and you remember that it is an unfavourable circumstance when teachers have to work with equipment that is defective from any cause whatever.

16624. The Bazaar or Ross.—The distinction made here was this, that the teacher is not responsible for the equipment or for the building; but anything that could be regarded as the cleanliness of the school the teacher is responsible for. Well, your school could hardly be regarded as a clean, well-kept school with the walls and floor and desks having football marks, so I am afraid you would be held responsible and that it would be considered a matter not so much of equipment as of the way in which the equipment is kept—the keeping of the school and the cleanliness of it?—In reply to that, my lord, you will allow me to say that in the last 27 years there have been only two initials cut on the woodwork of my school. You will never find about the floor any bread or used paper lying about. I consider that I train the children in habits of cleanliness and neatness. I give that as a reply to that remark, but so far as the teacher is concerned, I do say that I could not very well stop the football marks on the ceiling and on the walls because my manager would not allow me to close out this evening organization.

16625. Mr. KAVANAGH.—I think it has been suggested to us that the inspectors in lowering the marks on account of defective buildings wished to bring pressure on the managers through the teachers. Have you ever had that suggested to you?—Well, of course, the only thing I know is this, that inspectors know that teachers who are looking for their increment will be quite prepared to spend £5 or £10 if they think that doing that will bring them in an annuity of £10.

16626. But, on the other hand, when the teacher has his increment withheld on account of defective equipment would he not go to the manager and complain?—He would go to the manager and complain if he thought there was any chance of the manager providing these things for him. He may do that, and if he finds that unavailing, in order to try to secure an annuity of £10 or £12 a year he will perhaps spend the money himself, as a large proportion of the teachers round about me have done, and Mr. Kelly says that if the teachers do not provide requisites for the schools out of their own pockets he may write on this report the bankruptcy of education in Belfast. I consider that report of an inspector of our group of districts is about the most valuable evidence that could be put before the Committee. Mr. Dewar says, in 1908, after these reductions had been going on, we say, for at least two years, that the proficiency of the schools throughout this whole group of districts shows an upward trend. Now, we want to know how the proficiency showed an upward trend if the percentage of good reports had fallen from 78 to 74.

16627. Mr. CONNOR.—Professor Healy quoted for you some observations of Mr. Kelly about the tone of your school and the children's eyes resting on bare walls. He said he could not commend its tone, but in 1904 he reported that an excellent tone prevailed in your school?—Yes, although the same conditions prevailed. I do not know of any change that there was as regards pictures or plants or maps or anything else. The school was in the same state.

16628. We have had it here that tone was indefinable, but it certainly appears to be not only indefinable but incomprehensible if the conditions were the same in your school in 1904?—My contention is that Mr. Kelly used the word "tone" in the sense in which we all understood it at that time, that was the moral tone of the children, how they conducted themselves under examination, how they comforted themselves, whether there was any indication of boys unfavourably giving an answer that was not theirs, getting an answer from a neighbour, or that sort of thing.

16629. It appears to me incomprehensible that he should state that he could not commend the tone on account of the walls not being kept as they ought to be kept. Have the Belfast teachers formed any considerable opinion as to whether each school should have its own school year?—The majority of the teachers think each school should have its own school year, and their reason for that is that they believe it is exceedingly difficult for any inspector, no matter how well trained, even one who has had experience as a teacher, to go into a school at the end of three months and estimate how much exactly of work has been done in those three months, because one teacher thinks he should teach rather slowly and perhaps only cover the ground in the course of twelve months, and another teacher believes it is advisable to go rather rapidly through all the course in eight months and to devote the remaining two months of the working school year to revision.

16630. To repetition?—Yes. There was one point in the evidence I have given about Mr. Dewar. The inspector says the teachers had not initiative, that they followed the inspectors as leaders. Now, I contend that it is a very difficult to get teachers in any branch of education not to follow to some extent the style of examination that their students or pupils are going to meet with, and I think that if inspectors when they are going to examine would give such questions as would compel the teacher to teach on right lines there would be no difficulty at all about having good teaching. We believe that we are able to teach well in Belfast, and we are striving our very best to meet the requirements of the new programme, and those reports of the inspectors that I have handed in, almost universally would, with scarcely an exception, show that. It is only in the case of one inspector in our whole district during some years during which reports are made, that a doubting tone was noticed in his report, and that is Mr. McMillan, and Mr. McMillan seems rather reluctant to give any praise.

16631. That is 1906?—Right up to 1909 all the reports are favourable as to how education is going, but the facts so far as we were able to get them are in that column that was taken; and, of course, the only way we could find out whether the figures for the whole of the schools of the district would bear out the reports given by the inspectors would be to ask the Commissioners to make a return of what the reports were on those schools.

16632. Mr. BERRY.—Your contention is that if the examination was conducted on right lines the teacher would teach on right lines, and if the examination becomes mechanical the teaching becomes mechanical?—Oh, certainly. The reason why the teachers did cramming in geography on the heights of mountains and depths of lakes and that kind of thing was that they knew perfectly well that if the children did not know those things they would have been condemned as being inefficient teachers. The teacher will always try to do what he expects the inspector will require.

16633. Do you think it is an ideal thing that teaching should follow examination?—I do not think it is an ideal thing at all, but unfortunately it is almost universal, as far as I know, in every branch of education.

THIRTY-SEVENTH DAY.—THURSDAY, 17TH JULY, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

PRESENT:—SIR SAMUEL DELL, M.A., LLT.D., LL.D. (Chairman); The Most Rev. DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross; SIR HIRSH SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; MR. JOHN COFFEY; MR. HENRIAGE E. B. HARRISON, B.A.; MR. JEREMIAH HENLY; MR. WALTER MCMURROUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.; MR. THOMAS MICHAEL KETTLE, R.L.; and

MR. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

MR. DAVID ELLIOTT, B.A., Treasurer of the Irish National Teachers' Organisation, examined.

16884. The CHAIRMAN.—Are you on the retired list now?—Yes, Sir Samuel, I retired about four years ago.

16885. What was your position when you retired?—I was Principal of Madrid Street National School, Belfast.

16886. How many years had you been a teacher in the service of the Board?—I was principal for almost 45 years.

16887. And you had been an assistant before that?—I never was an assistant; I became a principal at once. I was appointed pupil teacher of the Ballymena Model School.

16888. So you served the greater part of your time under the two systems that preceded this new system?—I served for nine years under the system that preceded the results' system, and then I served for almost nine more under this present system.

16889. So you have seen all three systems?—All the changes.

16890. And in how many schools have you been a principal?—I was a principal in four schools.

16891. All in the neighbourhood of Belfast?—No, I was in one in Craigs, that is beyond Ballymena. It was a new school, and I was there for almost two years, and then I went to Bushmilla, and I was there for 19 years, and then I came up to Westbourne in Belfast. I was in two schools in Belfast and two in the country.

16892. Who was the manager at Craigs?—Well, it was a farmer in my day, a Mr. Miller. Dr. Baile afterwards became manager.

16893. Then that is all of your personal history that I need ask you, and you have nothing to add?—Well, I have nothing to add.

16894. You come here as representing the National Teachers' Organisation?—Yes, I understand, Sir Samuel, that the teachers you have had here, the four from Belfast, were merely representatives of the Deputationists to Dr. Starke.

16895. They represented the Deputation to Dr. Starke?—Yes, and now I not only represent the Belfast teachers, but I represent the teachers of all Ireland.

16896. When you say the Belfast teachers, you mean that you represent the local association?—Yes.

16897. What is the title of that association?—The Belfast National Teachers' Association. That was the association that got up the memorial to the Board.

16898. Are you also an accredited representative of the National Teachers' Organisation?—Yes.

16899. Mr. KELLY.—Is the Belfast association a branch?—Yes, it is a branch.

16900. The CHAIRMAN.—Has it an independent existence?—No, it is merely a branch of the National Teachers' Organisation.

16901. What is your position? Are you Chairman of the Belfast Association?—I am merely a member of the committee.

16902. I thought you were Chairman?—I was at one time, but we change every year.

16903. Who is Secretary?—Is it Mr. Knight?—No, Mr. Knight has retired, and there is Mr. Jamison, who will be here next week, and Mr. McGill.

16904. You are a member of the Committee of the Belfast Association?—I am.

16905. And what office do you hold in the National Teachers' Association?—I am a paid Treasurer of the Irish National Teachers' Organisation.

16906. You are a colleague of Mr. Mansfield, who is Secretary?—Yes, he is Secretary.

16907. And Miss Mahon is the President for the year?—Yes.

16908. How long have you held the office of Treasurer?—There is an election every year, and this is my fourth year.

16909. And I suppose the business of that office of Treasurer is very considerable?—Oh, yes, there is a very considerable amount of business to be done.

16910. Does it involve your travelling to Dublin much?—Well, from 12 to 15 times a year.

16911. And I suppose you have to attend all the meetings here?—I have to attend all the meetings of the Executive Committee.

16912. What is the total membership of that organisation?—It is between 9,000 and 10,000.

16913. Well, it does not therefore take in all the teachers of Ireland?—Oh, no; there are a few unassociated, but it is increasing.

16914. I think the total number of teachers is about 14,000?—14,000.

16915. That is men and women?—Men and women.

16916. And, of course, among those 14,000 there are a number of assistant teachers?—Oh, yes, a considerable number of assistant teachers.

16917. How many meetings have you in the year?—From eight up to thirteen.

16918. That is meetings of the General Organisation?—Of the Central Committee. We have only one meeting of the General Organisation, that is the annual meeting held during Easter week.

16919. And how often does the Committee meet?—The Committee meet here from eight up to thirteen times a year.

16920. You have to attend all those meetings?—I attend all those meetings.

16921. I believe you have been President of the Belfast Association?—Oh, yes, I was President a number of years ago, but we only make the President continue for one year. There is another organisation that I am president of for a dozen years, but it is not officially connected with the Irish Teachers' Organisation; that is an organisation dealing entirely with the managerial question.

16922. It limits itself to the managerial question?—It virtually limits itself to the managerial question so far as it affects Protestant teachers.

16923. How long has that existed?—For about thirteen years.

16924. And have you had a great deal to do with the relations of managers and teachers?—Oh, yes, a vast amount of work.

16925. And have you taken decided action?—Well, we have taken, as far as we could, decided action. The only action we could take was to expose cases of hardship.

16926. Do you mean hard treatment by managers of teachers?—Met out by managers to teachers.

16927. Such as dismissals?—Such as dismissals.

16928. And have you had many cases of that?—Oh, we had a very large number, but they are getting fewer now.

16929. And in those cases have you carried the matter to the National Board?—Oh, yes, we carry it to the National Board.

16930. How were you received, was it by deputation?—We were received several times as a deputation by Dr. Starke.

18881. Did any of the other members of the Board ever receive you?—No, they never did.

18882. Was anybody present with Dr. Starke when you were received?—Well, usually his own private secretary was there.

18883. Were any of the other high officers present?—Well, I think, so far as I remember, sometimes one of the Secretaries.

18884. And I suppose in all these cases the complaint always came from the teacher?—Oh, yes, always from the teacher.

18885. And did you take pains to investigate these before you carried the matter to Dublin?—Yes, always, but we did not go merely with that particular case (except in one instance or so) immediately to Dr. Starke. We went on the general question to Dr. Starke.

18886. Did you not come up to try and get particular grievances removed?—Well, the particular grievance of dismissal without any appeal. We have done that.

18887. And did you get satisfaction?—Yes, very largely. It is only fair to say that Dr. Starke received us most sympathetically.

18888. And was action taken?—Action was taken in this way, that the Commissioners now have it in their rules that they can investigate any case where the teacher makes complaint against the manager.

18889. And do you take it that that is really one of the results of your association?—Oh, yes, we do.

18890. Is there any other change in the rules which is a result of your association?—Not as regards Protestant teachers. Of course, I can tell his lordship we don't interfere with the Catholic teachers at all. We call it The Protestant Teachers' Union in order to prevent any Catholic managers from imagining that we are trying to interfere with their rights.

18891. I understand that the only managers you deal with are the Protestant managers?—Yes, the Catholic teachers have accepted the Maynooth resolutions as a sufficient guarantee for them, and then we do not interfere with the Maynooth resolutions at all; we only deal with the Protestant managers.

18892. The Bismarck or Ross?—I presume most of the members of the Protestant Teachers' Union are also members of the General Organisation?—Oh, yes, decidedly.

18893. The Chairman.—Were there any other changes in the rules that you attribute to the action of that organisation of Protestant teachers?—Only those affecting the managerial question.

18894. You have mentioned one, was there any other?—Well, that was virtually the one that we wanted.

18895. That was the most important?—The most important. We had no appeal from the manager at all, neither to the Bishop nor to any other person. Then we went, as I say, several times to Dr. Starke and pointed out what we wanted, and not only did we point out what we wanted, but we pointed out the way in which we thought it could be done.

18896. I understand that in the Catholic schools there is a well arranged system of appeal. Has anything of that kind ever been established with regard to the Protestant schools?—Well, in some few cases it has been established, that is in that there is an appeal to the Bishop, but it is only fair to say that the Protestant Bishops have not the same position with regard to the Protestant managers as the Catholic Bishops have with regard to the Catholic managers.

18897. It is not recognised in the same way?—No.

18898. The Bismarck or Ross.—It was stated that the Church of Ireland Bishops offered practically a Court of Appeal just like the Catholic Bishops and that the Church of Ireland Managers' Association made that offer to the teachers, and that the teachers declined to accept the offer?—I do not know that it was made in all cases; I think it was made in one or two dioceses, but not generally.

18899. It was made in the diocese of Down and Connor, was it not?—I am not aware. We would not have accepted it, my lord; at any rate, because of the very fact that the Protestant Bishops have not the same position with regard to managers as the Catholic Bishops have. A Protestant manager may snap his fingers at the Bishop.

18900. You would not say that of some of the Catholic managers?—No, I would not.

18901. The Chairman.—I think I have heard, but I am not quite sure, and perhaps you will tell me, was there not an attempt of the Presbyterians to establish some form of arbitration?—There was. In fact after one of our deputations to Dr. Starke there was a meeting convened here by the representatives of the Presbyterian managers and representatives of the Church of Ireland managers, and they put forward a scheme before us. One was that the Bishop or a representative of the Presbytery, and then from that down to the various officials of the various churches should act as referees.

18902. They did make an attempt to establish a court of referees?—They did, but we refused because there were none of those courts of appeal that we looked on as satisfactory.

18903. Do you regard that change in the rules that you got carried out by Dr. Starke as giving the teacher a sufficient defence, as it gives something of a court of referees?—It gives something of a court of referees, but it does not give us a complete defence in this way. A case has never been brought up to test whether the Board will interfere in a case of dismissal where there is a referee (say the Bishop of the diocese) appointed. We do not know whether they would interfere or not. We never had a case of that kind. There was a case pending recently in the Co. Tyrone, where the Rector of the parish resigned through a dispute with the teacher. The Rector resigned the management and appointed one of the men who were opposed to the teacher. The teacher refused to accept the referee offered by the manager. He objected to the new manager as being a personal enemy of himself, and he appealed to the Commissioners. The Commissioners did not decide whether they would or not accept the position of referees as in an ordinary case. They came to this conclusion, that he was bound to accept referees as offered by the manager. The manager would accept no other referee but the one that he offered, and they were unacceptable to the teacher. The Board advised the teacher to accept them, and if he was unfairly treated, that then they would investigate the case.

18904. As a Court of Appeal?—As a Court of Appeal in that case, but that does not establish the right in other cases. Supposing a teacher has a Bishop as referee and that he appeals, it does not establish whether the Board would investigate it or not.

18905. May I take it that the result of this is that on the Protestant side the attempt to secure a reference to a personal authority has failed?—Has failed?

18906. As between manager and teacher?—Oh, yes, I mean as far as the manager and teacher are concerned, but I would be far from saying that it has failed as far as the Commissioners are concerned.

18907. I mean a local authority?—Yes, it has failed altogether with regard to that.

18908. Now there is another point on which we have heard a great deal here, and that is the burden thrown upon a teacher for the cleaning and upkeep of the school. Does that come within the purview of your organisation?—Yes, it does. We have one case here that I dealt with myself, and that is the case of Mr. Mervyn. I was involved in that.

18909. And was the investigation of that the work of your Organisation?—It was.

18910. And is that one of the most serious cases that you have had?—We have had worse cases than that.

18911. In Ballymacarrett?—In Ballymacarrett. That is the most glaring one, in Ballymacarrett.

18912. We heard in evidence that were a good many cases in Ballymacarrett where the teacher had obligations of that kind thrown upon him?—Yes.

18913. Does that still go on?—Yes.

18914. Is that in your own knowledge?—Yes.

18915. What things are the teachers paying for in your own knowledge?—In this particular case they paid for the upkeep of the school. They paid water rate, and they paid for gas and for fuel; in fact the whole upkeep of the school.

1978 July, 1913.]

Mr. DAVID EMMETT, B.A., examined.

[Continued.]

16010. Of course, the fund now is provided partly?—It is provided partly.

16011. With regard to the cleaning of the school in your experience?—It is done usually by teachers has that to the present day been done by the teacher in Belfast schools. In country schools it is usually done by the children themselves.

16012. Under the teacher's eye?—Under the teacher's eye.

16013. The Bishop or Ross—How do matters stand since the grant was given for the cleaning and heating of the schools?—Well, the teachers in some of those cases have to make up the money. As a matter of fact the managers, so far as I know, pay scarcely anything.

16014. The CHAIRMAN.—Is not the grant of the Government for heating given upon conditions?—The grant of the Government is given on the condition of pound for pound, that is, that the parish or local authority must give as much up to a certain maximum as the Board give. In a great many cases in Belfast the teachers have to make it up in one way or another.

16015. The Bishop or Ross.—The Catholic clerical managers passed a resolution that they would raise this money?—Yes, my lord.

16016. And this resolution was also adopted by the Catholic Bishops?—Yes, it was; and I believe, as far as I know, the thing has been strictly carried out. I have also reason to know that the Protestant clerical managers, the Church of Ireland Body, passed a similar resolution, and that the Presbyterian Body passed a similar resolution, but I believe the Methodist Body refused to pass the resolution.

16017. How is the thing working then among the Church of Ireland and Presbyterian managers since they bound themselves to those resolutions?—In some cases the parochial authorities carry out the obligations that they undertook then, but in some cases I know they do not. It is only fair to say that the Catholic managers so far as I know, and I have had a very large experience of teachers of all denominations, did carry out the obligations they undertook, and some of the Protestants, but not all.

16018. On which side would the majority be?—I really could not tell.

16019. You know some instances where the resolutions have been carried out?—I do.

16020. Do you know a certain number of instances where they have not been carried out?—Well, I could not say that, and I can tell you the reason. As Chairman of this Protestant Union, the cases where they have been carried out do not come to me, and the cases where they have not been carried out do come to me; so my experience would be, that in the majority of cases they are not carried out, but to say that would not be fair to the managers.

16021. Of course, you tell us quite fairly that it is only the bad cases that turn up?—That came to me.

16022. And you have no information as to the number of good cases?—As to the number of good cases, no.

16023. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you anything more to say about the work of that organisation, the Protestant Teachers' Union, with regard to managers and their duties?—Oh, we have been fighting for upwards of 25 years, and we were very cautious in dealing with them, and the newspapers were more cautious than we in publishing anything with respect to them. We took to publishing an annual, and we send that to the managers now. There is no manager now, I may say, who cares about coming under the public gaze.

16024. You have told us something with regard to the great organisation, the Irish National Teachers' Organisation. You have one general meeting in the year and nine committee meetings?—The Central Executive Committee sits as an Executive Body to carry out the operation of the organisation from one Congress at Easter to the other.

16025. It is a permanent standing committee?—Yes, a permanent standing committee.

16026. You have the statistics for that organisation?—Yes; we have two funds. We have

what we call the central fund, which deals with the general expenses, and then we established a couple of years ago (last year, this is the second year) what is called a Defence Fund, to deal with law cases and matters of that kind.

16027. Do you call it a Defence Fund?—Yes.

16028. How long has that been established?—Well, this is the second year.

16029. Was that established in consequence of events that occurred in Belfast and Clonmel?—Oh, no. Not as the immediate consequence. We felt for a long time the necessity of having some fund to defend the teachers. For example, persons in the more out-of-the-way places will take action against a teacher at law, for assault that may not have any foundation in fact. We thought that it was not fair for teachers to have to pay that out of their own pocket, and the defence fund is for that and any other cases in which we think there is injustice to the teacher.

16030. And I suppose I may take it that the great work of the organisation is to interest itself in the teachers' rights in relation to the National Board?—Yes.

16031. That is the principal function?—Yes, that is the principal function.

16032. Mr. KERR.—What is the total of subscription?—For the central fund each member pays 5s per year and for the defence fund 2s. per year. That is paid to the Central Committee, but we have in Belfast, for example, subscriptions for the teachers of 10s. per annum and for assistants, 5s. per annum.

16033. Mr. HENRY.—Is there not a benevolent fund?—There is a benevolent fund also. That is purely voluntary.

16034. The CHAIRMAN.—That is for cases of illness, I suppose?—Yes.

16035. Mr. HENRY.—What is the subscription for that?—5s. per annum.

16036. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you ever appealed to the Board in defence of teachers' rights in relation to the National Board?—Oh, yes, we have appealed several times to the Board. We as a Committee send an appeal to the Board because they do not encourage us to take appeals as a Committee, but they tell us sometimes to let the teacher appeal himself or herself.

16037. And do you take up that appeal?—Yes, as far as we can.

16038. In what way do you do it?—Well, if we find it is necessary we may try also to influence an individual Commissioner. For example, in a very bad case we may go to the Commissioner and point out and give him a history of the case, as far as we can, and try to get him interested in it.

16039. Do you send any document up to the National Board?—They go through the teacher.

16040. And have the Board received deputations from you—have they received representatives of the organisation in the National Board office?—Oh, yes, the whole Board received, I think about this time last year, a deputation from the Central Committee. They received a deputation from the Central Committee about this time last year that dealt with that minority rule that bears hard on teachers.

16041. By whom was that deputation received?—It was received originally by the whole Board, but I think there were six or seven present. I was not on the deputation. You know that while I am the Treasurer I am not a voting member of the Central Committee. Usually deputations do not send the Treasurer; he is merely an official.

16042. But is it in your knowledge?—Yes, it is in my knowledge, of course.

16043. The Bishop or Ross.—The same would be true of the Secretary, would it?—He is not a voting member.

16044. The paid Officers?—The paid Officers are not voting members.

16045. And the Treasurer and Secretary are paid officers?—They are both paid officers.

16046. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you any other information of importance relative to your organisation—were you President of the general organisation of the

1916 July, 1916.]

Mr. DAVIS ELLIOTT, B.A., examined.

[Continued.]

Irish National Teachers?—I was; I think that was in 1909. I have been President of the Protestant Union for some 12 years. Once I was President of the Belfast Association, and then I was President of the General Organisation at the Killarney Congress.

19053. And it is not the practice to re-elect the President?—No, it is not.

19054. The BISHOP or BORN.—You were only one year President?—I was only one year President. The rule is that the president should only hold office for one year now.

19055. The present President is Miss Mahon, of Burt?—Yes.

19056. Mr. KITTLE.—Was she not re-elected?—Yes, she only once. No other candidate appeared in the field.

19057. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you got a copy of the report of that deputation on the rule about re-election?—Possibly I may at home. You see I have a number of documents of that kind.

19058. Would you kindly make a note of it, and send it to the Secretary?—Yes, the Board will give you a copy.

19059. Now, were there any other deputations received by an official or by the Board itself?—We had deputations several times received by Dr. Starke, and some time ago (I think it was last year also) there was a conference between the representatives of the National Board and the Intermediate Schools, and, I think, of the managers of schools of all denominations and the representatives of teachers, over the question of these scholarships from National schools to Intermediate schools.

19060. Mr. HENLE.—Had you any special difficulty with regard to the reception of deputations by the Resident Commissioner?—Well, we had by the Resident Commissioner himself.

19061. Did he refuse to receive certain members of your organisation?—Yes, he did; he refused to receive Miss Mahon. I cannot remember the others, but Miss Mahon was one.

19062. And was Mr. O'Callaghan one?—Mr. O'Callaghan was one, and they published an unauthorised version of some deputation that had been received by Dr. Starke, and then he refused to receive them again.

19063. The CHAIRMAN.—Do you mean that the ground for his refusal to receive them was that they had published an unauthorised report of a previous deputation?—Yes.

19064. And he said he would never receive them again?—Yes, but he has since received Miss Mahon. I think it was a matter of civility.

19065. Mr. KITTLE.—But deputations in general are of?—They are of.

19066. The CHAIRMAN.—Now will you kindly read to us this statement that you have. I may say that there are certain points that we think are not quite within our terms of reference?—Well, I was not so sure of that myself, Sir Samuel.

19067. And I think you will be asked about those points when you have read it?—Very well. The only check on the power of making rules imposed on the Board is contained in Rule IV., which says, "The Commissioners will not change any fundamental rule without the express permission of His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant." This is an ineffectual safeguard, as it is impossible for any Lord Lieutenant to be sufficiently acquainted with the reasons for and against changes to be able to decide in many cases. For example, a parent supported a school on part of his estate out of his own pocket. This school had been used as a Mission Hall and had been consecrated for the performance of the rites of one of the Churches. The rule then was that a school could not be held in a building consecrated for the performance of the rites of any Church. When it was discovered at the inquiry for a grant that this rule was against the grant the Board abolished the rule, which never again appeared in the Board's rules. In addition to legislation by rules the Board occasionally introduces a new law by a circular. Sometimes these circulars are afterwards incorporated in the rules, but sometimes they are continued in force without ever appearing

among the Board's Rules. In June, 1906, a circular was issued to managers and teachers, and about the same time a book was sent to every school, in which all corporal punishments were to be recorded. A more absurd book was never issued by any public body.

19068. I presume you mean that the circular of 1905 related to corporal punishment?—To corporal punishment. I have a copy of it here. According to it no punishment should be inflicted until the expiration of ten minutes after the offence. All particulars, seven in number, must be entered before the punishment was inflicted, and in fact the whole system made as impracticable as possible. Some teachers took no notice of this absurd book and some inspectors never asked for it. Many parents objected to have all the little faults of their children noted in a book for future reference. The whole scheme is a failure, but the book has never been withdrawn and the regulation can still be used against the teachers by the Board and its officers. There can be no doubt it has made discipline more lax, and is bad for the children. No mention of the book and its absurdities has ever appeared in the Board's Rules, and it is questionable if the Lord Lieutenant ever heard of its existence.

19069. With regard to book stores, that is one thing that we are clear about that does not come within our term?—My only purpose in offering it was to show the absurdity of the rules.

19070. But it is a long way from anything that we have to do with?—I know, and besides it is abolished now.

19071. Do you think it worth keeping?—I do not think it is worth keeping.

19072. The next point you have is one that is clearly within the terms of reference, that is with regard to a uniform school year?—Yes. Another example of legislation by circular is that of March, 1904, establishing a uniform school year commencing on 1st July each year. This rule caused great confusion and trouble in the years 1904-5-6, and is still the cause of trouble to the teachers, and is disliked by most of them. Its advantages are few and its disadvantages many. It is impossible for any man under the system of a uniform school year to judge of the progress which should be expected from schools from day to day and from week to week. It is thus the cause of injustice to many teachers, and should be abolished. Teachers have three additional school years:—(1) The civil year ending 31st December, and calling for elaborate annual reports; (2) the financial year ending 31st March, when capitation and some other payments are made; (3) the inspection year, imposing heavy burdens in making out other annual returns. Inspectors send out forms for these annual returns marked in coloured pencil "to be filled immediately," and do not visit the school for many weeks or even months. This is a great hardship for teachers, and should be stopped.

19073. What do you mean by this year?—That is the school year, the examination year, the year for the inspection, or the inspection year. Inspectors insist on teachers having a plan of work made out in advance and they should be forced to have the same, and a rule should be made either that they give due notice of the inspection or should come inside 14 days of sending the papers. Criticism lessons for monitors were also established by a circular issued in 1904. This was incorporated in the rules in 1905, and the regulations connected with it caused much trouble to teachers. As a result some teachers now have no monitors, as they think the trouble connected with them too great for any advantage they receive from their services. Another injustice connected with the employment of monitors is that teachers are required to devote extra time to their instruction, for which they receive no pecuniary reward. One of the most fantastic and at the same time most retrograde and unsatisfactory rules of the new system was that of grading. Teachers are nominally divided into three, but really into four grades. In two of these grades there are three increments each, in one grade two increments, and in the other one increment. Increments are triennial, and as teachers must remain

* Vide Appendix I.

L

17th July, 1912.]

MR. DAVID ELLIOTT, B.A., examined.

[Continued.]

three years at the maximum of each grade before promotion to a higher it follows that 98 years at least, under the most favourable circumstances, are required to reach the maximum. When all other barriers to promotion, such as average attendance, reports of inspectors, etc., are taken into account a teacher's prospects cannot be called bright. Some system should be adopted whereby a teacher would have greater certainty of a reasonable income after a dozen years' service. By the adoption of the new system in 1900 the status of teachers then in the service was entirely changed without any notice being previously given and without any choice on their part of remaining under conditions the same or even similar to those existing when they entered the service, and depending upon which they became teachers. Classification and many things they had prized were swept away and vested rights abolished. Many teachers entering the service under one set of conditions had to begin anew under an entirely different set and attempt to gain a new position. All incentives to study were abolished and an attempt made to keep teachers in a position of mental mediocrity. The maternity rule was first heard of through the Press at Easter, 1911. Teachers at once protested strongly against it as harsh and unjust. By it vested rights were swept away and teachers heavily penalised. Even in cases where it was impossible to obtain a substitute the penalty was exacted. The rule has now been virtually withdrawn in the case of existing teachers, and this withdrawal is an admission of its injustice and a conclusive proof of the wisdom of those who made it for the offices they occupy. Rule 127 (b) is another most unjust rule. At one time the Board prohibited ladies from teaching in boys' schools. It was evident that they then thought men competent to teach boys. Now they have changed their minds, and only women must teach small boys. This rule wrought great injustice to many teachers, and is still the cause of injury not only to teachers but to children. In some schools managers do not permit boys to be enrolled in girls' schools, and the Board will not permit them to be enrolled in boys' schools, and so if these children attend school at all they are in the boys' school but not enrolled. In such cases compulsory attendance is rendered null and void. In 1908 fees for teaching all extra subjects, except Irish, were abolished, and subjects hitherto paid for as extras were made ordinary subjects. It was stated that increments and promotion would depend in large measure on how these subjects were taught. The fee for teaching mathematics was restored in 1908-9. It was evidently found impossible to defend the new arrangement, and the change after so short an experiment reflected no credit on those responsible for the new regulation.

16974. Was that advanced mathematics?—No, just elementary mathematics.

16975. I thought it was advanced, being an extra subject?—We never had advanced mathematics in the National schools at all; it was the very elements of Algebra and Geometry and Mensuration.

16976. Now will you go on to the question of vacations?—In the rules for 1908 managers were permitted to close their schools 40 days each year for vacation. In 1900 vacation was restricted to 30 days. It seems some schools had closed for fair days and holidays in addition to the 40 days for vacation, and had not been open for the 200 days required by the Treasury. Instead of dealing with these the new rule penalised schools which had taken neither fair days nor holidays. After causing considerable trouble the Board was forced to return to the old period for vacation in the year 1905. This was another of the Board's failures in legislation. In the great revolution in rule making in 1902 scarcely any change was made in the rules restricting the liberties of teachers. Practical Rule III. still remained the same as in 1898, and was as follows:—"To avoid fairs, markets, and meetings—but above all political meetings; to abstain from controversy; and to do nothing either in or out of school which might have a tendency to confine it to any denomination of children." That prohibited any conscientious man from going to church as it is a meeting. Not thinking this sufficient restraint on the liberties of teachers two rules (180 and 181) still

further emphasised the servile condition of teachers. "180 (a). Teachers of National schools are not permitted to carry on, or engage in, any business or occupation that will impair their usefulness as teachers. (b). They are especially forbidden to keep public-houses, or houses for the sale of spirituous liquors, or to live in any such house."

16977. The Bishop or Ross.—Would you approve of a teacher keeping a publichouse?—Certainly not, my lord.

16978. Or his living in a publichouse?—Well, it is possible that he might live in a publichouse in some out-of-the-way place, where it is very difficult to get lodgings. The local hotel, which is really a publichouse, may be the only place which he can get.

16979. The Local Government Board have a very similar rule about rate collectors; but you do not disapprove of the rule?—Oh, no, I do not disapprove of the rule.

16980. If you have no personal objection to the rule what is your point in bringing it in here, because when I saw it I thought you did object to the rule?—I brought it in as a specimen of the minuteness of the regulations that we are subjected to. There is another illustration of that which comes in later.

16981. Would not your objection have much more force in the case of a rate collector, because the rate collection of the country are very much fewer than the teachers; and they have made that regulation for rate collectors though they are so much smaller a body of people?—Yes. There is another regulation that I do object to. Since the Local Government Act came into operation the following new clause is added:—" (c). Urban Councillors, Rural Councillors, Poor Law Guardians, Members of School Attendance Committees, etc., are not eligible for the position of National teacher." Rule 181 was changed in 1902 so as to bring it into harmony with the Practical Rule, and as if not sufficiently comprehensive "etc." is added so that any whim of the Board or its officers might be used to curtail still further the liberties of teachers. In 1902 Rule 181 is as follows:—" (a) The Commissioners regard the attendance of teachers at public meetings or meetings held for political purposes, or their taking part in elections for members of Parliament, or for Poor Law Guardians, etc., except by voting as incompatible with the performance of their duties and as a violation of rule which will render them liable to withdrawal of salary." Teachers are graciously permitted to act as presiding officers and polling clerks at elections. This rule if literally carried out would prevent teachers from attending church and other religious meetings. In the recent editions of the rules attendance at public meetings is not prohibited, but "etc." still remains, and no teacher dare go to hear a speech from the Prime Minister or the most eminent politician on pain of dismissal. A further slight concession is made in permitting teachers to be appointed "additional Councillors," but they are still prohibited from contesting any constituency.

16982. Would you approve of a teacher going into a contested election?—Yes.

16983. Either local or Parliamentary?—Yes; they do it in England, my lord. The teachers in England and Scotland both take part in contested elections.

16984. But you have to consider the state of feeling in Ireland?—I do not think it affects the matter at all, and besides I do not think teachers would be likely to go into such contests.

16985. But it might happen that the very man that ought not to go into a contested election would?—Yes, but so far as I have heard in England and Scotland the teachers take part in contested elections and there is no objection there. Another restriction has also been added in recent years, and not only are teachers prohibited from keeping or living in publichouses, but the following is added to rule 88 (a):—"and the husband or wife of the owner or co-owner of such house will not be recognized as a National teacher." I knew a case some time ago where a teacher had a publichouse and his wife was a teacher and she was living apart from him. Under that rule the wife would have been penalised, she was not living in the publichouse or living with the husband. They were living apart.

1936. The CHAIRMAN.—He ran a publichouse?—Yes, and she taught the school. In the rules for 1912-13 there are some specimens of refinements in rules apparently made by the authors of the original rules. For example, in the 1902 edition, rule 181 (a) "the attendance, etc., is incompatible with the performance of their duties, and is a violation of rule, rendering them liable to withdrawal of salary." This is changed into "is strictly forbidden." All these rules restricting the civil rights of teachers should be abolished and teachers granted the same freedom as in England and Scotland.

1937. The BRANCH OF ROSS.—When you say "all these rules" you mean the rules last discussed, that is with regard to civil rights?—Yes. For many years children were allowed to go home at the time for recreation without any official restrictions. Suddenly an attempt was made to force all schools to have two meetings each day, with an interval between of not less than one hour. When the single meeting was adhered to no child was allowed home at play time, and over-eagerness inspectors spent much time detecting unfortunate children who were guilty of the crime of entering their homes at play time even when these homes were beside the school. This foolish and cruel rule has now been relaxed, and children are permitted to go home at the written request of their parents, and with the leave of the manager. In cases like this some of the Board's officers were very zealous in commemorating their efforts on petty points that were of no importance and harassing teachers about them.

1938. The CHAIRMAN.—You refer to the manager's confidential report?—Yes.

1939. That has been abolished, by the way?—Yes, quite recently.

1940. Then is it of importance?—Well, I give it as an important illustration.

1941. But you make your case rather weak when you wind up by saying that this report was abolished. Do you think it strengthens your case?—Well, I do not know that it does, but it is merely to show the bungling, if I may use the term, of the officials.

1942. It is really a matter for yourself?—Well, it will not take much space, and I sent a copy of the report* that you have not got to the Secretary, a special copy of the official report that was sent out to managers. In the edition of the Rules for 1932 managers were invited to send confidential reports to the Education Office giving their views of the teachers and their work. This was a most inquisitorial procedure, and gave a spiteful manager ample opportunity of injuring a teacher without any chance of the teacher having an opportunity of defending himself. Nothing ever more plainly demonstrated the hostility of the Board's officials to the teachers than this wretched confidential report. In addition to a table giving the names of the teachers, their position in the school, and their character, there were 25 questions asked, one of which was regarding the personal cleanliness and tidiness in attire of the teachers. This report was only abolished in 1911, after having been in use for 3 or 40 years. It is only fair to say that many managers threw this wretched form into the waste paper basket. The Rules now number 334, with numerous sub-heads, schedules, and programmes, and form a bulky volume of almost 200 pages. In the latest edition there are some changes of a hypocritical nature such as "the new manager is required" being changed into "the new manager must"; and "the manager may, with the approval of the Commissioners" into "it is desirable that the manager should, with the approval of the Commissioners." These are examples of time wasted in useless changes made apparently for the sake of change. The Treasury recently gave a grant for heating and cleaning the schools, and the Commissioners in the spirit of the Pharisees of old decreed that the money for cleaning should be spent on the outside of the house. I understand they have modified this decree during the last few months. Recently the Board has issued a new regulation about Readers in schools. Hitherto the meanings of words and annotations were permitted, and indeed en-

couraged. So long as the Board published readers meanings and annotations were freely given, but now it seems meanings of words are strictly forbidden in books and all meanings and annotations must be supplied by the teachers. The reason for this rule is not obvious. It will waste time and throw new burdens on teachers, who have already more than they can bear. It will cause loss to publishers and restrict teachers in the number of books from which they may select. Now, with regard to Notes of Lessons, this is another of the fads forced on teachers, and in most cases is injurious rather than helpful. Every teacher should prepare his lessons and know what he is going to teach, but to force a teacher to make elaborate notes and teach by them is not only a waste of time, but hampers a good teacher in his work. The number of changes in rules, the omission of rules, and the number of new rules introduced is very harassing to teachers. Some inspectors seem to make a speciality of trying to detect teachers in the breach of new rules and changes of rules, and harass teachers have to make up these very carefully. I have taken the trouble of counting the changes, the new rules, and the omitted rules since 1898. In 1899, 1900, and 1901 no new rules appear to have been issued. Circulars were numerous in those years, but the great changes in the rules were made in 1902. In 1903 and 1904 there were few changes and these were unimportant. I give in tabular form the changes in rules, the new rules, and the omitted rules for the following years:—

Year.	No. of Rules changed.	No. of New Rules.	No. of omitted Rules.	Total.
1898	26	219	25	250
1905	322	—	35	246
1906	67	15	2	104
1907	95	4	6	105
1908	49	8	9	59
1909	75	2	—	77
1910	59	5	2	66
1911	55	4	1	60
1912	32	6	5	43
Totals	652	234	67	1,163

Average per year, ... 353

Many of these new rules and changes have been complete failures, but this has not deterred their authors from new adventures in rule-making. Most of them have been very unfavourable to the teachers, and show the incompetence of the administrators. The circular on Tons, which apparently was intended as a boon to the teachers, has turned out to be a curse rather than a blessing. It puts a new power in the hands of unscrupulous inspectors by which they can injure teachers with impunity. They have only to complain about the tone. Junior inspectors can neither raise nor lower reports without the sanction of the senior. A very fantastic idea was promulgated about 1903. Three inspectors were to inspect a school in succession. The first was to pass on his notes to the second and the second to the third, and thus there was to be an infallible opinion of the value of the work in each school. This scheme seems never to have been realised, as it was too fantastic even for its authors, and was stillborn.

1920. The BRANCH OF ROSS.—You have discussed some rules that have already been repealed?—Yes.

1921. And also some circulars that are no longer in force?—Yes.

1922. And you have told us that you were anxious to discuss these to show the changing and fickleness of the National Board?—Yes, my lord.

1923. I think your object is to show that the National Board has not displayed any great capacity or competence in the making of rules?—Yes.

1924. You say in one place that this shows their unfitness for the office they occupy and proves the failure in legislation and incompetence of the administrative authority—expressions of that kind?—Yes.

* Vide Appendix XXVI.

17th July, 1913.]

Mr. DAVID ELLIOTT, B.A., examined.

[Continued.]

17096. Very well, I presume that you wish us to adopt the view that the Board are an incompetent and inefficient body?—Yes.

17097. That is the object of this paper?—Yes, that is the object.

17098. And I suppose that if we are to regard the Board as incompetent and inefficient it would follow as a natural consequence that the Board ought to be abolished?—Well, it is not so much, my lord, the Board as its officers, who are permitted to administer in the name of the Board.

17099. Well, we have had a good deal of evidence on that; and I am afraid that when you read the evidence you will find that the Board is not more responsible than the teacher, but at any rate it is the Board you attack all along here?—Yes.

17100. So I suppose you would wish that some authority was put over education rather than the National Board?—The National Board as at present constituted and administered by officials; but I have no desire, and I do not think it is within the terms of reference to discuss the present situation of the Board.

17101. It is exactly from that point of view that I am looking at your paper, because you see what you really have discussed here is the incompetency of the Board, their incompetency and unfitness for their position, and therefore it seems to me that the conclusion from your discussion is inevitable that as an incompetent body it should not be there?—It is the officials who administer in the name of the Board that I am attacking, and I can only get at the officials by indicting the whole system.

17102. Then you do not express your view as to whether the Board should continue to exist as it is or whether it should not?—No, I do not.

17103. But you admit your paper tends towards the abolition of the Board?—If you take it as confined to the Board itself, but my intention is not to indict the Board but to indict its administration.

17104. But taking your paper as it stands it attacks the Board?—Yes, because the Board permit officials to act for them.

17105. And you agree with me that this Committee has no warrant to discuss whether the Board is competent or incompetent?—Yes.

17106. And therefore it will follow, I suppose, that you will agree with me that I cannot question you on this paper?—Oh, if you wish.

17107. Sir HIRAM WILKINSON.—You complain very much of the rules made by the Board without notice, and of those rules afterwards being withdrawn. Do you think that would be prevented in some measure by notice being given of the intention of the Board to make rules?—Yes, or what they have in England, that is, that the rules should be laid on the table of the House of Commons for such a time before they come into operation.

17108. Is not that notice of the rules?—Yes, that is notice of them.

17109. There is another way of giving notice of rules, and that is under an Act of Parliament publishing the fact of the new rule being intended to be made in the *Gazette*?—Yes, but you see that we have no Act of Parliament dealing with Irish education.

17110. We are speaking now of the desirability of notice being given either by their being laid on the table of the House of Commons, or by notice being published in the *Gazette*. Which of those two forms of notice would you prefer?—That is notice in the *Gazette* or the laying of the proposed rules on the table of the House of Commons.

17111. Yes?—I would say the table of the House of Commons would be better. The teachers as a body do not read the *Gazette*, but they see the notices in the House of Commons.

17112. Do you mean to say that newspapers do not give you any information about what appears in the *Gazette* upon such subjects, that the teachers' newspapers do not take an interest in what appears in the *Gazette*?—Well, as a matter of fact nothing has appeared affecting them in the *Gazette* so far, so that I could not say whether the teachers' paper would give them or not.

17113. I should say they would be very inefficient papers if they were conducted for the benefit of the

teachers and did not take notice of publications appearing in the official *Gazette*. That is one form of endeavouring to meet the difficulty. There is another form suggested, and that is consultation with the teachers or the managers, as the case may be, before the rules are issued?—Yes.

17114. Now which would appear to you to be the more efficacious?—I would think consultation with the teachers and managers would be better. You see we would know them, and the Board would know what the mind of the teachers or the mind of the managers was.

17115. In that case would you prefer the consultation with the teachers?—Yes.

17116. Now, with regard to that circular* about the infliction of corporal punishment, it appears from the question which the Lord Bishop has asked you, that what you said with regard to some of the subjects is capable of being misapprehended, and I want to make clear how far you object to the circular with regard to the infliction of corporal punishment. Do you agree with the following rule:—Corporal punishment should be administered only for grave transgressions, never for failure in lessons?—Well, I would agree with part of it, not with the whole of it. I would agree only for grave transgressions, but it is just possible that failure in lessons may be a grave transgression.

17117. Do you think that on occasion corporal punishment might properly be administered for failure in lessons?—Yes. It would depend on the cause of the failure. For example, in the case of stupid children it should not be done. I say that if a child does its best there should be no corporal punishment or no punishment then inflicted, but there are some children (I have come in contact with them myself) who deliberately refuse to work, and if the right of corporal punishment is taken away from the teacher in that case it would be a serious injury to the child. Punishment is inflicted at present not for the failure in lessons but for disobedience. For example, I set a child to do a certain work. It refuses to do it, it won't do it. Well, I may punish it and put it down for disobedience.

17118. And is that done?—Well, I have heard of it being done; of course, I never did it. I did not punish children for lessons, for stupidity or anything of that kind.

17119. Have you had occasion to inflict corporal punishment under this rule, at all?—Well, I never attended to it, Sir Hiram.

17120. Now take No. 2.—The principal teacher only should inflict corporal punishment. Do you agree with that?—I do not. The teacher under whom the offence is committed, I think, should inflict the punishment; and it should be left in the hands of the principal teacher. He should have a discretion to say whether the assistant should inflict the corporal punishment or not.

17121. But there should be no corporal punishment unless after application to the head teacher?—Oh, no, I would not say that. I would say that a teacher in charge, for example, of 40 or 50, which is a very common thing in large schools, and in a separate room, should have the complete discipline of the class, and a principal who was worthy of his position would very soon find out whether that teacher was competent to inflict corporal punishment or not.

17122. And you would not have him refer in each case to the principal teacher?—I would not.

17123. Now what about the 10 minutes rule?—I would not agree with that at all. For example, it is really in most schools only very naughty children that are punished, and all you give those children is a rap on the hand with a cane. Those children will stand grinning and laughing at you for the 10 minutes, and go away, even after you have given them a very heavy rap on the hand with a cane, and that injures discipline.

17124. You think that the 10 minutes interval might injure discipline?—Yes.

17125. Such cane or rod may be used for the purpose of inflicting corporal punishment?—Yes, I agree with that.

* Vide Appendix L.

17038. Biting the children's ears, telling a teacher to do so, and similar ill-treatment are absolutely forbidden. Do you agree with that?—Yes. I do not think that that is a matter that teachers ever do so far as my experience goes. I never knew of a teacher biting a child's ears.

17039-30. The CHAIRMAN.—Did you never find that?—No.

17041. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Then you agree that it should be visited with severe penalties?—Yes, I would.

17042. And that the teacher should not carry about a cane or other instrument of punishment?—Well, I do not think it is wise for him to carry a cane, but the teacher might carry a pointer with him for his geography lessons and so on.

17043. Do you consider it would be proper to apply it for other purposes?—As a matter of fact it was worn by an inspector some years ago that a large pointer was the proper instrument.

17044. What is your opinion?—I would not carry a cane at all, but very few teachers carry a cane as far as my experience goes.

17045. Do any?—I believe some, very few. I have been in a large number of schools in Belfast, and in all my experience (that is until I retired) I never saw a teacher in any of the schools in Belfast with a cane.

17046. It says frequent recourse to corporal punishment will be considered by the Commissioners as indicating a bad tone and ineffective discipline. Do you agree with that?—I do not, for this reason, that there are schools that I know, for example, where the infliction of corporal punishment is necessary. There are other schools in different localities in Belfast that I know of where it is not so. I know of one school in Belfast at present where there is no corporal punishment at all, that is Mr. Boyd's, who appeared here before you. He has other means I can tell you. Then there are other schools in low localities where it is necessary. He is in a good locality, and has pupils who are the children of the better class of artisans and clerics and people of that kind. There is very little trouble there, but when you go into slum localities really the only way that you can get any good, and that you can bring a boy to his senses is by corporal punishment. Supposing, for example, that discipline is depending upon time, and in one of those schools in the slum localities there is very bad tone and very bad discipline, and of course there are a considerable number of cases of corporal punishment; while in a school in a good locality which might be looked on as having excellent discipline there are few cases or scarcely any; in fact, none.

17047. And do you think that there are a number of slum schools where threatening corporal punishment becomes almost a necessity?—Almost a necessity.

17048. And that cannot be avoided by a more sympathetic treatment of the boys?—I have tried sympathetic treatment with some of those boys myself, and I have talked to them more kindly than their fathers and mothers would do, and they have laughed at me and repeated the offence again. The only way with boys of that kind is really to let them feel the cane.

17049. The particulars should be entered in the book before the infliction of punishment. What do you say to that?—I would say that, as in some of the localities in England, it depends on the principal teacher himself whether he would enter these or not, and it should be altogether optional. I met a teacher during my holidays, and he entered the punishment and then he does not indite it all at the end of 10 minutes; it might be at the end of a month; and if the boy behaves himself he does not indite it at all, and he writes over it, "cancelled."

17040. Has that been effective?—Well, he says it is, though it has been objected to by the Board's officers.

17041. There are two points of view about that as a deterrent and the holding over for punishment for a long period is not in some cases considered perfectly

comparable with right feeling?—Well, my opinion is that if punishment is to have its effect at all it should be inflicted at once.

17042. Then would you put it in the book at all—would you have a book?—Yes, I would put it in the book, but I would permit it to be in the discretion of the principal teacher whether he would enter that or not. What I really believe is the case in some of the localities in England.

17043. Would you enter the names?—If I entered it I would enter the name of the boy, but it would be only in the case of very grave offences that I would enter it at all.

17044. What about the athletic parent?—I think a teacher who would write about it would be very foolish; he need not give notice; supposing the fault comes out it might be awkward. For example, in my own experience boys have been guilty of faults who are now men occupying highly honourable positions. For example, a boy might take a pencil from his neighbour and I would enter that as stealing, and there that would remain against the boy for all time.

17045. And that you would not consider desirable?—I would not consider it desirable at all.

17046. I suppose you see no objection to showing the book to the manager on his first visit after the punishment?—Oh, no; no objection to that.

17047. Well then this given as an illustration of legislation by circular. I suppose in some of those cases you would suggest that a conference should be held before some, at any rate, of the circulars are issued?—Yes, the same as rules.

17048. Now, on the question of a uniform school year, you are in favour of a school year for each school?—I am in favour of each school having its own school year.

17049. What suggestion have you to make with regard to the other three annual periods?—My suggestion is that one annual report would be enough for the year; I do not see the good of any more. For example, we have too elaborate a series of annual reports to make out, one for the civil year ending the 31st December (that is the one that appears in the Board's Blue Book), then we have one for the inspection year, perhaps more elaborate, and I do not see the use of putting teachers to the trouble of making out two annual reports.

17050. Mr. HARRISON.—Annual returns?—Yes, returns.

17051. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Are the same particulars given?—Well, they are largely the same.

17052. They go over the same ground?—Very largely. For example, if the school year is any time from January to the end of March it will be the same year you are giving as the full year, but so far as I know there is no use made of those returns in the office.

17053. But the only objection then is as to the returns that are made for the calendar year and the returns that are made for what we call inspection year?—Yes.

17054. You think that is a duplication of work that might be avoided?—That might be avoided.

17055. You have no objection to the financial year ending the 31st of March, when capitation and some other payments are made?—Oh, no, that is the only pleasant year.

17056. With regard to what you say here about promotion and grading of teachers, you consider the rules introduced in 1900 did not take sufficient account of the facts that then existed as to the number of the teachers a continuance of any benefits to which they might have been entitled?—Decidedly.

17057. And you think that justice would have been better done if the old rules had been allowed to remain with regard to those teachers?—Yes, or if they had been allowed an option of remaining under the old rule or coming under the new.

17058. In some cases that, as we all know, is allowed—it is allowed, for instance, in the case of a civil servant to come under the old Superannuation Act or under the new Superannuation Act?—Yes.

17th July, 1918.]

Mr. DAVID BILMOTT, B.A., examined.

[Continued.]

17069. But does it not occur to you that in this particular case it would have been impossible to have a system under which new men rose by the merit mark of the school, that is to say as results of inspection, while others still continued to earn money by results, for results if they were to be abolished must be abolished altogether and it would not have been possible then to have carried on the old system without very great modification?—Oh, no, it could not have been possible to carry on the results' system without modification.

17070. So, with that particular change that was made (assuming that it was right that the change should be made and the general consensus seems to me to be that the results' system had to be done away with) whatever other things are overlooked it would have been impossible to have the two systems worked contemporaneously?—I suppose it would.

17071. But you consider that in the rules that were made the rights of the teachers who had entered under a different state of circumstances were not sufficiently guarded?—Yes, that is my position.

17072. The CHAIRMAN.—What is this an illustration of?—This is a very old story now, 10 years old, is it not?—Yes.

17073. What do you want to prove by that?—The whole business is to prove that the Board have treated the teachers very unfairly.

17074. Is it aimed at the present system?—Not at the present system, but at the present administrators.

17075. I want to know what practical use there can be in discussing this, having regard to the remedying of grievances of those teachers if such grievances exist?—I know.

17076. The HONORABLE MEMBER.—It was not the present administrators who introduced this change at all?—I think it was Dr. Starcke.

The HONORABLE MEMBER.—Dr. Starcke did not appear in the system till it was all planned. The assumption of the teachers that it was Dr. Starcke who procured the change in 1900 was wrong.

Mr. HENRY.—The point that Mr. Effels is raising is this, that though a promise was made in 1900 that the rights of the teachers would be preserved, and no injustice would be inflicted on any teacher by the change, yet there are teachers who feel that they have not been fairly treated, and that their cases have not received the consideration which the Commissioners promised them.

17077. The CHAIRMAN.—We know that, and we have based from the Board's officials that there are some hundreds of those cases still, which they are trying to remedy?—They are very long about it.

The CHAIRMAN.—If that is the point you are making, we have heard it.

17078. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—You speak of criticism lessons as regards the monitors?—Yes.

17079. Do you refer to that as showing that foolish or inconsiderate regulations have been made and repeated or do you want to state that there is at the present moment some grievance of teachers with regard to that?—At the present moment the criticism lessons still continue, and any quantity of grievances. A provision that they have to give a criticism occasionally is all right, but they have to conduct them once a week and write out notes, and quite a number of things of that kind.

17080. And do you think that the teacher is more heavily burdened than is necessary by imposing that on him?—Yes, that is the point.

17081. And you think that grievance still continues?—Still continues.

17082. The maternity rule we have had, and the evidence with regard to that is that the maternity rule has been, so far as persons having vested rights are concerned, withdrawn?—Yes.

17083. Is there any grievance in its continuing with regard to those women who come into the service hereafter—is it a bad rule?—Well, it is bad in this way, that any teachers will get a month for illness without having to employ a substitute, and I think a married lady should get the same, that she should get a month's leave of absence without having to employ a substitute.

17074. An ordinary teacher gets a month's leave on account of illness?—Yes.

17075. And you think a prospective mother ought to get the same?—Yes, the same.

17076. Does she not get that?—She does not, so far as I know.

17077. Are you quite sure of that, because I was under the impression that it was pointed out to us that she could get that?—Well, not that I know.

17078. Well, that is the only point you make with regard to those who may come in afterwards?—Yes.

17079. Does 127 (b) operate injuriously?—Oh, yes, it does.

17080. With regard to boys' and girls' schools?—Yes.

17081. Tell us shortly how it does?—I will give you a case in point. You are aware that there are a considerable number of infant boys in boys' schools, and when there is a certain number of them the teacher may have an attendance qualifying him for second grade or third grade as the case maybe, and when the infants are taken away that takes away the attendance.

17082. We have had thought before as the fact that the diminution of the numbers operates adversely on the principal teacher of the school. And the question is whether that diminution is necessary or unnecessary?—I do not consider it necessary.

17083. You consider that where there are infants a man is quite competent to teach them?—Quite competent.

17084. That is your point?—Yes.

17085. And under the present rule that cannot be done, and there must be some female to look after the infants?—That is the present rule.

17086. And you say that that operates injuriously on the head in the matter of the numbers in attendance?—Yes; I taught infant boys myself for many years, and I thought I taught them as well as a lady would teach them.

17087. Then with regard to the abolition in 1906 of payment for extra subjects, I think you have already stated what you mean, that the rule with regard to those extra subjects should have been continued, and that the teachers should now be receiving payment for extra subjects?—Yes.

17088. That is the point?—Yes.

17089. Is it a serious matter?—Well, in a large school it is a serious matter.

17090. When were the extra subjects taught?—Usually after school hours.

17091. And then at the present time, as I understand, under the operation of the present rule a man is required to teach after school hours and receives no remuneration for doing so?—Oh, no. We had quite a number of extra subjects up to the introduction of the new system, and then they were restricted to Irish and mathematics, and then mathematics was removed out of the list of paying subjects altogether and made compulsory, and then it came back again, and there is payment for mathematics still.

17092. That is mathematics taught within school hours?—Or outside school hours.

17093. But it may be taught within school hours?—It may be taught within school hours.

17094. What are the other subjects for which you think that there ought to be extra payment given?—Oh, there were quite a variety of extras given up to 1900.

17095. Not after that?—Not after that.

17096. Then you refer to vacation being reduced from 40 to 30 days. Was this reduction of 10 days due to the provision that there must be 300 days attendance?—It is abolished. The amusing thing in connection with that was that the teacher got more vacation when there were 30 days than when there were 40.

17097. How was that?—They have to get as a holiday every holiday occurring during the vacation, such as a religious holiday or a National holiday, or any thing of that kind occurring during the vacation. They allowed it to be cut out, not to be given as vacation but as a holiday.

17098. You say that vacation is reduced to 30 days?—No, it is now 40 again.

[17th July, 1913.]

Mr. DAVID DEASOTT, B.A., examined.

[Continued.]

17060. You were merely referring to a change in the rules which was reconsidered?—Inconsiderate.

17100. Now, with regard to civil rights, the point is this, that civil servants, men who receive pay from His Majesty or His Majesty's Government, are under a certain rule, if not defined yet understood, to abstain from certain actions which other citizens are allowed to do?—Yes.

17101. And the question is whether in Ireland under its present conditions the teachers could now be left to themselves to judge what is right, or to be governed if they transgress, because I take it that a civil servant, if he began absconding, although he might not be forbidden under any written rule, would be held up by his superior officer?—Yes.

17102. Do you think that a teacher should be held up under similar circumstances?—Yes, I think that would be quite sufficient, if he transgressed.

17103. You would have it an understood rule, but not a prescribed rule?—Yes, not a prescribed rule.

17104. Do you not think that it is in Ireland a little too soon to introduce that?—No, I do not think it is. I think in 99 cases out of 100 a teacher might safely take part in politics, such part as they would take.

17105. Now, with regard to two meeting days, you refer to some absurd consequences?—Yes.

17106. In the matter of marking of pupils, when a pupil comes in the morning and does not return after play hour, how do you mark him?—Mark him absent for the afternoon. If it is a full meeting day, a whole day, the mark is cancelled.

17107. But there are some pupils who are allowed to go home in the interval?—Yes.

17108. If those do not return, do you mark them for the whole day or the half day?—No, it is cancelled; the whole attendance is cancelled if it was a single-meeting day.

17109. For different schools they have different rules?—They have at present. There are very few schools now that have two meetings in the day.

17110. But it would be an advantage to the teacher to give the half mark instead of no mark?—It would be a disadvantage to him. A great many of the children in most of the city schools in Belfast, for example, would not come back at all. We had a manager, for example, in Ballymacarrett who had the two-meeting system and he continued this for a year and he found that the attendance had fallen, that a great many children did not come back again, and he had to return to the single-meeting.

17111. That is an objection to allowing the pupils out at all for dinner?—No; the children go home now often and there are very few of them that do not come back again. There are so few that do not come back that it does not affect the attendance as much as to really reduce the average to any extent.

17112. It does not affect the average practically?—No.

17113. But in some places we know that some pupils do not come back in the afternoon?—Yes.

17114. And some pupils are allowed out, while some are not?—Yes.

17115. And it seems to be an understanding that if pupils are allowed out and do not come back, half attendance is given to those who do not come back?—That is where they have the two-meeting system.

17116. If a pupil takes sick who is not entitled to go out for his midday meal, and has to go home, the whole mark for the day was to be cancelled?—Of course.

17117. Would it not be an advantage in that case that the morning attendance should count half, and the afternoon attendance should count half?—It would be an advantage, but it would not be an advantage to make it a two-meeting school for the children go out for an hour and they must have an hour, and you have far more difficulty in getting them back again than if the time allowed is only half an hour, and to come straight back again.

17118. If they are allowed out the interval must be an hour?—Yes, if they are allowed out and it is a two-meeting day, the interval must be at least an hour. That was the rule, and they did not give an hour for a one-meeting day, and the children were not allowed

out at all for a long time, but now they have relaxed the rule. The manager can give them leave to go out on the application of the parent.

17119. And if they do not come back you say the attendance is cancelled?—The whole day's attendance is cancelled.

17120. Now, the manager's confidential report has been done away with?—Yes.

17121. You may be surprised to hear that that was considered by some members of the Board staff as in favour of the teachers as giving the manager an opportunity of speaking favourably of the teacher. That is not, as I understood from your remarks about it, the view taken by the teachers themselves?—The view taken by the teachers, as far as my experience went, was that a manager favourable to the teacher did not send it in at all, and it was only a manager who had some grudge with the teacher who sent it in. That is the position so far as I know.

17122. When you speak of a spiteful manager, do you think that it was wrong with such relations between managers and teachers, that the manager had up to recently at any rate the right of dismissal?—Oh, there was a great deal of friction between managers and teachers up to recently. There is not so much friction now. There was a considerable amount, and it is some cases still, I know.

17123. Well, with regard to heating and cleaning, you can furnish us with a circular which justifies the charge that managers or teachers were directed to apply the part of the money for cleaning to the outside of the houses?—Yes.

17124. With regard to the explanation as to readers, it may be of interest to know that many here who are well acquainted with the subject consider that annotated books are not to the advantage of the scholars?—Well, my own opinion is that it depends on the annotations.

The CHAIRMAN.—There is a great deal of truth in that. The objection of the Intermediate Board was that whenever a text book was put in one had a great lot of heavy editions were got out, some doing far more harm than good. But I should be sorry to say that all those annotated editions were bad.

17125. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—With regard to the notes on lessons, I do not understand you to object to a teacher preparing for his lessons?—Certainly not.

17126. But you think that some of the inspectors make too great a requirement of written notes?—Yes, and they must have them; it would not do for a teacher to have notes on lessons written for last year and use them over again. They must be written the night before.

17127. Some inspectors insist on that?—Some inspectors insist on that.

17128. The CHAIRMAN.—Do some inspectors actually insist on an experienced teacher showing his notes of the night before?—Showing his notes of the night before.

17129. Mr. HARTMAN.—Has he any right to do so under the regulations?—Oh, yes, certainly he has.

17130. Clearly?—Yes.

17131. To require that every teacher should prepare notes for lessons?—Yes will have here next week, or perhaps to-morrow, a Mr. Smith who will give you evidence that he was asked to do so. He is a graduate of the Royal University, and I understood he has been asked for his notes, and notes have been demanded of other teachers, men older than I am in the service, and they have been asked why they have not their notes.

17132. Were notes ever demanded of you as a teacher?—No, they were not. One young inspector said: "Well, I need not ask you for notes"; but I know as a matter of fact that teachers get their notes and they carry them with them, and when an inspector comes in they work by these notes, and if the inspector is not there they work the other way. They have to date them but they do not teach by them. Teachers have told me that again and again.

17133. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Now, as to the multiplicity of changes in the rules, we have had some explanation of that, with regard to revision of the word-

1745 July, 1913.]

Mr. DAVID ELLICOTT, B.A., examined.

[Continued.]

ing; and you think that the multiplicity of changes in the wording of rules is likely to embarrass people who work by those rules?—Of course.

17134. And you think that those ought not to be unnecessary changes of the words?—No, I think there should not be.

17135. Well, with regard to the inspectors following one another in successive years, you approve of a system under which inspectors would remain in their places for a considerable time?—Yes.

17136. Now, we have had evidence of inspectors being quite frequently changed?—Yes.

17137. In your view which is the most efficient way of inspecting schools, and which is the best for education?—I think the better way is that a man should remain for a number of years in the same place and inspect the same schools.

17138. Mr. HANCOCK.—I understand that you object to the changes that the National Board have made in the rules without submitting them to the Lord Lieutenant; but I believe that it is only the fundamental rules that they have to submit to the Lord Lieutenant?—Yes, the fundamental rules.

17139. Well, you would not call those very minor rules on the subject of corporal punishment fundamental?—No, I would not; but they are looked on by the Board as fundamental, as far as the teachers are concerned.

17140. If they are looked on by the Board as fundamental, the Board have no business to issue them without the approval of the Lord Lieutenant, and the question is are they fundamental?—I do not think they are at liberty to issue them without the sanction of the Lord Lieutenant.

17141. You say the Commissioners should not change any fundamental rule without the express permission of His Excellency, but the question is whether these small rules of corporal punishment are fundamental or not. Nobody could regard them as fundamental?—Well, I would not.

17142. And what you say there is not to the point. Now, will you tell me about the corporal punishment, what is your objection to the 10 strokes rule before inflicting the punishment—is not the rule in the interest of the teachers themselves?—I do not know that it is in the interest of the teachers; but there is an instruction that the teacher is in a bad temper.

17143. Well, the teacher may be in a bad temper, and he may need to be protected against himself?—Yes, but I do not think it is often the case.

17144. Very likely not, but he may get into terrible trouble if he administers punishment in a bad temper, may he not?—Well, I would never administer punishment in a bad temper, and I think a teacher should never get out of temper at all.

17145.—Law reports go to show that in a good many cases punishment is administered by men in bad temper, and I cannot see any objection to that rule, which is a rule that is self-imposed by a large number of teachers?—Yes.

17146. Now, you allege that punishment in slum schools is necessary?—Yes.

17147. Now, would you be surprised to hear that that is absolutely contrary to my experience and to the information that I got from teachers who had experience both of slum schools and of schools attended by better class children? These said that corporal punishment could be abolished almost entirely in slum schools where the children are so habituated to it at home; but that it was absolutely necessary in cases where the schools were attended by well-to-do children who are well fed and high-spirited. That is the experience of a very large number of teachers, whose experience is entitled I think to considerable respect. Now, you have told us about the forms for the financial year, and the forms for the school year, and you also made some mention of forms issued by inspectors?—That is the forms for the school year that are issued by the Inspectors.

17147. It is not a third form?—Oh, no.

17148. Only they ask you for it at a certain time?—Yes.

17149. You know that form to be drawn up before the end of the school year?—I have known them sent, and as a matter of fact one of the clerks we got from the Board says they should be issued once in six months.

17150. It is a return made up to date?—Made up to date.

17151. And upon which the final return of the school year will be based?—Yes.

17152. Does that involve a great deal of clerical work?—A great deal of labour.

17153. What was the aim of your school?—About 100 in average attendance.

17154. How long would it take to make up such a return?—It would take me perhaps two or three evenings.

17155. To make up the return?—To make up the return.

17156. A full return or only a partial return?—The full return. As a matter of fact for a number of years I did not make it out; one of my assistants did it.

17157. It would take you that time supposing all your books, summaries, and all were kept posted up to date?—Yes, posted up to date.

17158. Now, you made a great point in your evidence of the constant changes of the rules in the Board?—Yes.

17159. But is not change the normal state of all administrative bodies?—Yes; there is a certain amount of change, but I looked on the changes in the Board's rules as abnormal.

17160. You give us a table of them, I think?—Yes.

17161. Do you include in this table all those rules verbal changes?—Yes; but there are very few of those.

17162. You would hardly call those changes, would you?—Yes; there are little verbal changes such as I have given; but there are very few of those.

17163. At any rate you admit that a considerable number of changes are inevitable?—Oh, yes, there are changes inevitable.

17164. And do you not think that it is very necessary that a good many experiments should be made in education, where, after all, expert opinion is constantly in a dual state?—Yes.

17165. It is in the nature of things that there should be a good many experiments?—Yes.

17166. Then do you not think that it follows from that that there must be a number of rules which have to be withdrawn as the result of experience?—Yes, a great many experiments must be made, but I do not think that experiments should be made on a whole country such as Ireland. If an administrator wishes to make an experiment, he should make it on a limited number of schools, to see how it would work.

17167. Well, that has not been the experience of England and Scotland. Changes have been very numerous there, as you will see if you look at their codes?—I do not think they are so numerous as with us.

17168. I do not think there is much in it; but, after all, I suppose you will allow that the withdrawal of those rules that were found not to work well redounds to the credit of the Board?—Oh, certainly the withdrawal of those that did not work. It certainly redounds to their credit to remove them.

17169. Mr. HANCOCK.—You remember when the system of grading teachers was introduced?—Yes.

17170. In the case of a teacher entering a training college before 1900 (take 1899, for instance), what would be his standing when he came out?—He might come out anything from second class up to first; he might be second or first, or sometimes first or first.

17171. That refers only to the few, but take the case of an ordinary person entering the profession for the first time?—He might get any class at that time that he could take, coming out. So far as I remember at that time, he was eligible even for first class.

17172. Now, I have here the rules for 1899, and if you look there under second class you will see the classification awarded teachers at the end of their course of training. In what class was an ordinary student leaving the training college placed at the end of his

course of training?—In the second class, and in the first division of second class if he passed with special distinction.

17174. What is meant by passing with special distinction?—A special percentage above 65.

17175. Tell us how long had he to remain in that class?—A trained teacher who passed first of second under the old system would be awarded second division of the first class after a period of two years' highly efficient service.

17176. So that that teacher leaving the training college if he answered 65 per cent. after two years' consecutive highly efficient service could be promoted to the second division?—Of first class.

17177. And how long would it take him to get to the first division of first class?—The first division will be awarded to the teacher after a subsequent period of seven consecutive years of highly efficient service or three consecutive years of such service after passing an examination in a special course; and if he took 65 per cent., he would probably go on for the examination at the end of three years, and as a matter of fact I know a man who did it.

17178. In how many years could he reach the top?—Well, that would be five years.

17179. I suppose you are aware of the table in the Commissioners' Report for 1895, showing the average salaries of the different classes. Take that table and look at the salaries paid to the teachers from the State?—Yes.

17180. Now, what was the average salary that second class men coming out of the training college would get?—£90 12s. 7½d.

17181. That was the average salary for men entering the service after being trained?—Yes.

17182. What would be the average salary now (remember, the State salary, not the local salary), that would be paid to him in the second division of first class?—£108 18s. 7½d.

17183. And for the first division of first class?—£139 12s. 7½d.

17184. We have had the average salary of men entering the service after coming out of the training college at £50?—Yes.

17185. And the average salary of those after a lapse of two years was £108?—Yes.

17186. Now, I want you to look, if you please, at the report for 1898, and tell us how many first of first class teachers there were in the 20 years or so preceding the new system. What is the first year given there?—1878.

17187. What is the number of first of first class teachers at that time?—303.

17188. Then in the next ten years?—In 1888 the number is 484.

17189. And next?—In 1898, 1,170.

17190. Now, as far as you know as a teacher, was there any limitation whatever to the number that would be admitted in first class?—No limitation as far as I know.

17191. What was the percentage of first of first class teachers compared with the total number of teachers during those periods?—In 1878 the percentage was 2.4; in 1888 it was 4.3; and in 1898 9.8.

17192. When the grading system was introduced, and that applies, remember, not merely to teachers then in the training college who had no vested rights, but to those who were actually in the service and had come out. Of course, you are aware that all entering the service had to enter in third grade and will you say what is the average salary that they would get there?—For third it is £56.

17193. So that a man entering the service then got £56, even although trained, instead of £95. Is not that so?—Yes, that is so.

17194. And after two years what would be his salary under the old system?—£108.

17195. Now, what would he have under the most favourable conditions under the grade system in two years?—He would only have £68; and, of course, there is now the Herford grant, but it did not come in then.

17196. And what would he have after five years under the old system?—After five years he could come up then to be first of first.

17197. Now, under the old system his salary would be how much?—Well, it might be £139 after five years.

17198. And now, under the grading system, what would it be under the most favourable conditions?—Under the most favourable conditions he might get only one increment, and that would be an increment of £7.

17199. He would get a certain £63 instead of a possible sum amounting to what?—Instead of a possible £139.

17200. And then what length of time is required to get to the top under the new arrangements?—Thirty-six years.

17201. And under the old arrangement?—Under the old arrangement it was possible to get it in five years.

17202. Now, do you think that the present arrangements are as satisfactory to teachers of ability as the arrangements under the old system?—Oh, certainly not.

17203. Do you think it was fair that teachers who had entered the system under the old conditions should have this new grading system imposed on them without consulting them?—No, I do not think it was fair to compel them to enter into the new arrangements without consulting them, in which they were much worse off.

17204. Was it fair to a man of first class that happened to be in a small school to be put into a low grade?—No, certainly not.

17205. And kept in that low grade?—And kept in that low grade.

17206. To get first class salary then what would be the average attendance required?—Thirty-five.

17207. To get first of first do you know what average is required?—Seventy.

17208. To get second of first at present what average is required?—Fifty.

17209. And then in addition to this you have, of course, the difficulty of the standard numbers?—Yes.

17210. How many places were open as far your knowledge goes for teachers in the first division of first class?—That is under the old rule?

17211. Under the old rule?—There was no limit. We had no standard numbers then at all, and you see from the numbers that I gave you from this book, that they rose from 263, first division of first class, in 1878, to 1,170 in 1898.

17212. So that taken as a whole do you consider that these rules acted adversely to teachers of ability?—Yes, of course.

17213. Now, I suppose you are aware of this, that in 1906 there were considerable complaints on the part of teachers of dismissals by the Commissioners?—Yes.

17214. Do you know how Dr. Traill described these cases?—Enforced inefficiency.

17215. And I believe your organisation made a considerable amount of fuss with regard to that?—Yes, I was one of the men in it; we calculated that the dismissals for inefficiency had increased by 200 per cent.

17216. Do you think that the teacher had at the time a satisfactory mode of appeal?—Oh, no, I never looked on it as satisfactory.

17217. Now, in this list of variants I want you to look at rule 90. Now will you read for us Rule 96 as it stood up to 1908?—"Should a teacher have any well grounded cause of complaint against his manager he may submit a statement of the case to the inspector, who, after due inquiry, if necessary, refers it to the Commissioners for consideration. Should any teacher feel himself aggrieved by the conduct of the inspector he can make his appeal through the manager of the school and it will receive attention from the Commissioners. If the matter of appeal should affect both the manager and the inspector the teacher may then submit his case in writing to the Commissioners, who, if necessary, direct one of the Chief Inspectors to examine into and report upon it for their information."

17218. What was proposed to be given instead of that?—What was given instead of it is what appears in this copy here. Instead of what I have read it runs in this way:—"Should a teacher have any well grounded cause of complaint against the manager or the inspector he may submit his case in writing to the Commissioners for their consideration."

17219. Now, do you think that gave the teacher the same right of appeal as the old rule?—Oh, certainly not.

17220. Do you think it limits him?—It limits him.

17221. And was intended to limit him?—Well, we can only judge of the intention by the act.

17222. Now I want you to look to the rule on the opposite page. I think it is Rule 96f—Rule 96.

17223. Read it as it was up to that date?—"Teachers whose schools have declined in usefulness and efficiency or who have conducted themselves improperly may be admonished, reprimanded, fined, deposed, or dismissed."

17224. Now read the rule that was substituted for that?—The new rule in 1908-9 is this:—"96. (1.) Teachers who have declined in efficiency or who have conducted themselves improperly are dealt with as the Commissioners determine. (2.) Before serious penal action is taken against a teacher he is afforded an opportunity of forwarding to the Commissioners any statement he may desire to submit in his defence. (3.) In no case is a teacher dismissed for inefficiency before he has ample opportunity of remedying the defects in his teaching which have been reported by the inspectors. (4.) In no case is a teacher dismissed for inefficiency on the report of a single inspector. Before recognition is finally withdrawn his work is tested by means of a thorough inspection of the school as a whole and an examination of all the standards. This inspection is conducted by one of the senior or chief inspectors and in the presence of one of the Commissioners, if they think it desirable. (5.) Should it appear necessary to dismiss a teacher for inefficiency a formal statement of the grounds on which it is proposed to take action is furnished directly to the teacher. Any representations or explanations which he may submit in his own behalf are carefully considered by the Commissioners before final action is taken."

17225. Now, do you think that that extension of the rule in any way protects the teacher?—Oh, certainly not; I do not think so.

17226. What we have there are new rules by which the rule granting the right of appeal to the teacher is limited and restricted and the rule for the removal of a teacher is extended?—Yes, certainly that is there before us.

17227. Mr. KAVANAGH.—In answer to his lordship, the Bishop, you said that you were not so dissatisfied with the system, but with the administration of the system?—Yes, with the administration.

17228. Does that mean that you were satisfied with the present system—what I mean by the present system is the merit mark and inspection and triennial increment?—Oh, no, I am not satisfied with that system. What I referred to in answer to his lordship was the Commissioners themselves, the Board as at present constituted.

17229. I am afraid we cannot go into that?—Yes, I am aware of that; his lordship mentioned it.

17230. Would you point out now any objection you have to what I call the present system of merit marks?—Well, I look upon the merit mark as altogether unequitable and in fact unfair. It is impossible for a man to really determine what should be the merit mark of a school from all the time that the inspector can spend in it.

17231. You mean that they are too short a time there?—They are too short a time and do not know the local circumstances of the case.

17232. But suppose an inspector has been in a district for four or five years, will he be able to gauge the merit mark of a school in two or three hours?—I do not think he can in my experience of them. For example, take that example on tone, I was carrying out the recommendations in a circular all my life time. Before the circular on tone was there I tried to make the boys active and the girls active and intelligent and intent on their business and to train them up in morality.

17233. You would not do away with the merit mark altogether?—I would, altogether.

17234. How would that affect the efficiency of the school?—I do not think the merit mark increased the efficiency of the school at all, and I do not think its abolition would diminish the usefulness of the school.

17235. Would you leave it entirely to the report of the inspector?—To the report; provided that the teacher was not reprimanded or admonished or some serious fault found with him, he should get his increment.

17236. But do you not think that the merit mark is to a certain extent a guide to a teacher, and would you like to be left entirely to a confidential report by an inspector?—I would not like to leave it to a confidential report. I would have no confidential report about a teacher. Every report sent about a teacher should be sent to the teacher or manager, or both.

17237. It always seemed to me that if I was a teacher I should like to know or to have some sort of guidance to show whether my school was going up or down?—Well, I do not know. I know that I have seen these reports during the results time. I have before me a case. A teacher showed me his examination record under the results' system, and it was only on results that the report was to be written, and the examination record was a record that any teacher might be proud of, but the report consisted of two pages of fault finding from beginning to end and not at all in accordance with that record.

17238. And then it is your opinion, and you represent a large number of teachers, that the merit mark should be abolished?—Yes.

17239. Altogether?—Yes, decidedly.

17240. Then with regard to triennial increment, are you in favour of that or not?—I am in favour of annual increments.

17241. Automatic?—Automatic, practically automatic.

17242. Do you think that would affect the efficiency of a teacher?—I do not think it would. I have known teachers who were inefficient teachers, not very bad, but there is no artificial aid that will make a bad teacher good. It may make him more sover on the children. I would trust the teacher to do his best.

17243. But it would make a good teacher indifferent?—I do not think it would. I think a good teacher would do his work independently of aids, and I do not think the present system of discouraging teachers is a good one. A man is working and doing his very best, a clever man, and I know many of that type, and working to get a good mark, and still kept down year after year.

17244. Has your association ever worked out a scheme of annual increments?—Oh, no, we never did.

17245. Are you aware that any scheme will do some injustice to some teachers, and I think his lordship will admit that?—Oh, yes, it may to some teachers, but I think that no scheme that would be likely to be adopted would bring injustice to so many teachers as the present one.

17246. Of course, as you have shown in answer to Mr. Hooley, the change from 1909 to the present system brought about a good deal of hardship?—It did.

17247. Are you aware that the teachers as a body were opposed to that change?—They were not opposed to the change from the results but they were opposed to the change in the mode of giving increments. They were always opposed to the results' system, and we were misrepresented in the old days as a lot of lazy, worthless fellows because we opposed the results' system.

17248. Mr. HENLEY.—I think you are missing the point of Mr. Kavanagh's question. Were the teachers opposed to the change from class salary to grade salary?—Oh, yes, they were very much.

Mr. HENLEY.—I think you will find that the young teachers and the teachers who happened to be in small schools and had brains were opposed to it, but the teachers who happened to be in large schools with low classification were rather satisfied with the change.

17249. Mr. KAVANAGH.—But any change will bring some hardship to some teachers? You are quite prepared to admit that?—I am quite prepared to admit that.

17250. But you think that it would bring less dissatisfaction than the present system?—Than the present system.

17th July, 1935.]

Mr. DAVID ELLIOTT, B.A., examined.

[Continued.]

17251. Now, have you any fault to find with inspectors as you meet them?—That comes in later in my evidence. I have something to say about that, some serious fault to find with them.

17252. Mr. KERRIE.—Your view is that apart from any question of merit marks a teacher will do his work if he is capable of doing it?—Yes, that is my opinion.

17253. And that apart from merit marks he has first of all the sense of duty to his pupils and then he has a reputation to sustain amongst the people among whom he lives?—Yes.

17254. And you think that that will be quite sufficient stimulus to make him do the best he can for his district?—Yes, that is my opinion.

17255. And I gather from your evidence that you do not think that any system of labelling schools "good," "fair," or "excellent" can be equitable?—I do not think it can.

17256. There would be bound to be mistakes and the mistakes would be bound to lead to irritation and disappointment and discontent among the teachers?—Yes, that is my opinion.

17257. What is your view or what is the view of the organisation as to a uniform school year, whether it is better for each school to have its own year?—The teachers that I represent are all for each school having its own school year.

17258. You think it is unfair, I take it, to ground the mark of a school on the work done in two or three months?—Yes.

17259. And that the work done by the teacher cannot be properly assessed and properly determined in such a case?—That is my opinion.

17260. You say new rules have been made by circular independently of the rules set forth in what we call the code. What are the new rules that you had in view when you said that rules have been made by circular?—Well, the corporal punishment book.

17261. But besides what has been given to evidence already?—Yes.

17262. Have the teachers viewed with great dissatisfaction some rules or arrangements that have been made by the Board in connection with appeals without any circular?—Yes.

17263. The teachers thought that however unsatisfactory it might be and however limited it was by that new rule they still had the right of appeal to the Commissioners?—Yes.

17264. But it has turned out now that they have no right to approach the Commissioners at all unless the Resident Commissioner so determines?—Yes, we are aware of that now; we were only aware of that recently.

17265. Do the teachers regard that arrangement of the Commissioners by which they nullified one of their rules by a private regulation—do they regard that with dissatisfaction?—With great dissatisfaction, as far as I know, all over the country.

17266. Mr. KERRIE.—I understand that you are to give us evidence relating to two particular cases, the case of dismissal of Mr. Stewart and the case of Mr. Dewar?—Yes.

17267. And will you tell the Committee the direction in which those cases point?—The unfairness of the dismissal in the case of Mr. Stewart and the mode of trial that was adopted towards Mr. Stewart; but the worst case is the case of Mr. Dewar, the inspector, which was passed over without any punishment whatever.

17268. And those are cases in which you yourself have complaints to make against the inspectors' mode of conducting business?—Yes. Mr. Stewart got mixed up with a builder and he got a school, not his own school but another school, as security for his money. I have the correspondence here; it is not necessary to read it, but Mr. Hynde, the Chief Inspector, came down and went into Mr. Stewart's school and asked him for information about this. I should say that a brother of Mr. Stewart's was teacher of the other school.

17269. The BURROE or ROSE.—How did Mr. Stewart advance that money—his brother seemed to be the builder of the school?—Oh, no, my lord.

17270. Who was building the school?—He was a builder; a man called Bailie was building the school.

17271. For whom was he building it?—I could not tell you.

17272. Because a man does not start building a school on his own account, he must be building it for somebody?—I have known builders build a school on speculation.

17273. Not what they call bogus schools?—No; bogus schools are schools alleged to be built in the interest of teachers.

17274. The builder was building on his own account?—He was building on his own account.

17275. Mr. KERRIE.—That is not a usual form of speculation?—I can say I have known it done.

17276. The BURROE or ROSE.—And Stewart, the school teacher, lent him money?—Lent him money.

17277. Purely as a loan?—Purely as a loan.

17278. Without collusion with regard to that building?—That is Stewart's own allegation, and I think it came out in evidence afterwards amongst the lawyers that that was the state of affairs.

17279. But that is the beginning of the story?—That is the beginning of it.

17280. You think that there was no collusion?—Well, I could not say that there was not, and I could not say that there was, but even supposing that there was, it is the total I refer to.

17281. Mr. KERRIE.—Your point is with regard to the conduct of the inquiry?—That is the principal part of the complaint.

17282. And you do not know all the facts of the case yourself?—Not in the beginning, but I have here the correspondence, and Stewart came to me and asked me for help in the business in fighting to try to keep his position in the inquiry. When Mr. Hynde came down, for example, Stewart called on me and told me, and I told him to beware of what he was doing, and he said Mr. Hynde was his friend, and his case was not mixed up in it at all.

17283. Will you please tell us the facts relating to the inquiry?—Well, Mr. Hynde came to Mr. Stewart and asked Mr. Stewart about the building of this school and about matters of that kind as his friend, and I know that when Mr. Stewart consulted me he looked on Mr. Hynde as his friend; and he gave him all the information that he could; and then I have a letter here written by Mr. Hynde inviting Mr. Stewart to the inquiry. He says:—"Referring to our conversation regarding charges brought by R. J. Stewart against Rev. J. C. Emmerson Dewar, and counter charges by Mr. Dewar, an inquiry will be held on 7th March, 1907, at the Model School, Belfast. As your evidence may be of importance you are requested to attend."

17284. An inquiry was held?—An inquiry was held lasting for three days.

17285. Was Mr. Stewart present?—He was present only an hour and a half.

17286. Mr. HARRISON.—Who held the inquiry?—Mr. Hynde held the inquiry.

17287. Mr. KERRIE.—Your first point was that Mr. Stewart was not notified of the fact that there was any charge brought against him?—There was no charge made against him. He told me there was none; he assured me there was none. I warned him to beware.

17288. Mr. KAVANAGH.—A charge was brought by one schoolmaster against another?—No, the teacher complained against the manager.

17289. The BURROE or ROSE.—Were there not two Stewarts?—There were two Stewarts, two brothers.

17290. Mr. KERRIE.—Your complaint is that Mr. Stewart, the teacher, was not notified of the fact that any charge was to be preferred against him?—Yes, that is the first matter.

17291. But as a result of the inquiry he was dismissed from the service of the Board?—Yes, and dismissed partly on his own evidence and partly on evidence that he did not hear.

17292. Mr. HENRY.—When he was not under trial himself?—When he was not under trial himself.

17293. Mr. KAVANAGH.—What was the actual charge that he was dismissed on?—Well, it was on

the ground that he was part owner of the school. Well, as a matter of fact he was not part owner because the deeds were made out to the clergyman, and the clergyman closed the school afterwards.

17294. Mr. KERRIE.—Your point is that even if Mr. Stewart acted improperly in this matter he did not get a fair trial?—That is my point.

17295. You are not discussing the case on its merits?—I am not discussing the case; I am making out that he did not get a fair trial.

17296. First he gets no notice of any charge against him?—Yes.

17297. Secondly, he is present for only an hour and a half at this inquiry?—Yes.

17298. Secondly, he is present for only an hour and a half at a three days' inquiry?—Yes.

17299. You are not quite clear as to whether he volunteered evidence upon this inquiry?—He was there merely summoned as a witness. The letter that I read indicated that he was merely summoned as a witness. Mr. Hynes went to him and asked him about this and got the evidence from him privately.

17300. Was the finding of Mr. Hynes on that inquiry ever published?—No, never published, but I saw the finding, and I probably have it here somewhere.

17301. There was a protest made against the manner in which that inquiry was conducted?—Yes.

17302. And the Board ordered that another inquiry should be held?—Yes.

17303. And was that second inquiry held?—Yes, it was, and the manager protested against the inquiry being held by Mr. Hynes.

17304. As a matter of fact, it was held by Mr. Hynes?—Yes, and here is Mr. Hynes's letter, which I look on as important addressed to Dr. Adams, the manager:—"Sir, I beg to inform you that I propose to hold an inquiry into charges made against Mr. W. J. Stewart, commencing at 11 a.m. on Monday, the 12th inst. Your presence is requested. Mr. Stewart is charged with having violated and conspired to violate No. 178 (f) of the rules of the Commissioners of National Education, and the charges are based on evidence given by himself, his brother and the Rev. J. C. Emmerson Doran at an inquiry which I held on the 7th March and the following days."

17305. Was Mr. Stewart himself notified of the charges against him as regards the second inquiry?—Oh, yes, he was notified.

17306. He got due notice of that?—He got notice of that; the notice is virtually the same, but the point is that Mr. Hynes admits that he was dismissed partly on his own evidence and partly on that of his brother and of Mr. Doran, which he did not hear.

17307. Was that evidence repeated at the second inquiry?—Of course, it was. Stewart was not giving evidence himself. I do not think the Rev. Emmerson Doran and Mr. Stewart were there at all at the second inquiry.

17308. Do you know anything of the evidence at the second inquiry?—I think it was principally Mr. Stewart's own evidence.

17309. Are you sure there was a second inquiry?—Oh, yes, I am sure there was a second inquiry because there was a big row about it, and Mr. Stewart came to consult me.

17310. At first the manager protested against Mr. Hynes holding the second inquiry?—Yes.

17311. And subsequently the second inquiry was held?—Was held.

17312. And the result of that second inquiry was that Mr. Stewart was dismissed. You do not know what evidence was called at the second inquiry?—No.

17313. And what was the result of it?—I think he was dismissed again; the dismissal was confirmed.

17314. They found that he had in fact violated the rule?—They alleged that he had.

17315. Rule 178 (f) ought for the sake of clearness to be put in. That rule is that neither the teacher nor the husband or wife of a teacher, nor any other relative nor any other person in their interest, is allowed to be owner in whole or in part of a school-

house. Does it not look on the face of the facts as if that rule had been violated?—Well, I do not know. Well, Mr. Stewart was not a part owner of the school, but he lent the money. I do not think he was part owner, because really the owner was Mr. Emmerson Doran.

17316. The BRANCH or ROSS.—There is a distinction between a legal owner and a beneficial owner. Was Mr. Doran a beneficial owner?—I think he was both, and as a matter of fact he showed that he was both, because he closed the school afterwards.

17317. That would not follow; it might have been made over to him by deed without paying any consideration whatever?—It was made over to him by deed.

17318. Mr. KERRIE.—Your complaint is of the fashion in which the inquiry was conducted?—That is my complaint; it is not on the merits of the case at all.

17319. And your point is that Mr. Stewart was taken by surprise and evidence was elicited from him without any notice being given to him that it might be used against him?—Yes.

17320. And secondly you complain that Mr. Hynes, who you say had really become an advocate against him, was appointed to hold the second inquiry and to act also as the judge?—Yes, that is my point.

17321. That is the substance of the Stewart case?—Yes.

17322. Mr. HENRY.—The information which Mr. Stewart gave to Mr. Hynes was used against him on the second inquiry. Was there any means of getting that except from Mr. Stewart?—Oh, none.

17323. And did he repeat the same evidence?—I cannot tell you, but Mr. Hynes had no other means of getting whatever evidence there was but from himself.

17324. Was Mr. Stewart notified that there was a charge against him at the second inquiry?—Oh, yes, he was notified by the letter which I read.

17325. Mr. KERRIE.—The real point here was that he was taken by surprise at the first inquiry and evidence got from him which was afterwards used against him?—Yes, that there was an irregularity.

17326. You have also a case about Mr. Dewar. What were the facts?—Mr. Dewar came as Senior Inspector, to Belfast, and his brother was manager of a school in Donegal Pass and his sister was the principal of that school, and it is a rule of the Commissioners that the teacher must not be a relative of the manager, and Mr. Dewar, as you will see, visited the school and did not report it, and then questions were asked in the House of Commons about it, and the Board did not even then take action for some time, until another question was asked, and so far as we know Mr. Dewar suffered nothing, and his case was certainly as bad as Mr. Stewart's.

17327. Mr. KAVANAGH.—He was the inspector and his brother was the manager and his sister was the teacher?—Yes.

17328. Mr. KERRIE.—And the impropriety consisted in the teacher being sister of the manager?—Yes.

17329. But not, of course, in the manager being the brother of the inspector?—Oh, no, certainly not.

17330. The BRANCH or ROSS.—It was very awkward having an inspector inspecting his own sister?—Of course.

17331. What rule is there of the Commissioners covering such a case as that?—The rule is that the teacher must not be a relative of the manager. It is a very strict rule.

17332. The CHAIRMAN.—And the point is that Mr. Dewar never reported the fact of the relationship, that the rule was being violated?—No; I would like if possible to give those questions, and that you would give them in your report. I have got them here.

17333. Those that were asked in the House of Commons?—Yes.

Mr. KERRIE.—The first point is that the arrangement was improper, and secondly that Mr. Dewar did not report it.

17334. Mr. HENRY.—There is no rule against an inspector being a relative of the teacher?—I don't know that there is any.

17385. The BRISTOL or ROSE.—But it is opposed to natural propriety?—It is opposed to natural propriety. When attention was drawn to the matter in the House of Commons Mr. Dewar's answer was that his predecessor, Mr. Pedlow, reported the case and that the Board had taken no action, and he assumed that they disregarded it. On the 20th of June, 1910, in reply to Mr. Devlin, Mr. Birrell says that Mr. Dewar had told the Board that the manager had informed him that his predecessor, Mr. Pedlow, had reported the irregularity, and as no action had been taken he did not think it necessary to report it once more.

17386. Mr. HARRISON.—Has there ever been a case of a man accused of violating any of the rules being represented by a lawyer before the Board?—There was not an opportunity then, but there is now; and that is another point that should be taken up. The lawyer now has not got power to interfere further than by advising. The lawyer can whisper questions to his client to ask, but he has no right to interfere.

17387. The accused may have a legal adviser?—Yes.

17388. Mr. HENLY.—What authority have you for stating that a lawyer may be present?—Oh, we have had it in several cases. We had one here quite recently.

17389. You say as a matter of courtesy on the part of the Chief Inspector, but where is the right within the rule?—I do not know that the rule gives the right, but I know that as a matter of fact it has been done in several cases; the Commissioners have written to the teacher that he is at liberty to employ a solicitor, but he is not to take part in the inquiry, and I know that that was refused up to quite recently.

17390. Mr. HARRISON.—The Board do in certain cases allow legal advice. It amounts to that?—Yes.

17391. Mr. KERRIN.—Now tell us the facts of the reprimand which you received yourself?—Well, in 1906 there was a society called the Educational Reform Association in Belfast, and it published a pamphlet called "Secular Control of Secular Education." This pamphlet contained some statements on Dr. Stalker and the Commissioners generally regarding the condition of the schools and the Board's inaction in permitting some of them to remain in a filthy condition. Quotations were given from Mr. Dale's report, from the report of a representative of the Lancet, who visited Dublin schools, and from the Board's own inspectors' reports. These were certainly not complimentary to the Board and were commented on by the writer of the pamphlet. I had nothing to do with the writing of the pamphlet except that I supplied the material for the portion dealing with the managerial question, and did not know my name would appear on it till I saw it on the inside cover after the pamphlet was printed and largely distributed. On the 22nd of May, 1906, Mr. Hynes, Chief Inspector, paid me a visit in school. After some friendly talk on education he invited me out and produced the pamphlet from his pocket. He pointed to my name, and asked me was I the person whose name appeared as one of the committee.

17392. Had you known Mr. Hynes previously?—I never saw him till then.

17393. Did he tell you that he was Chief Inspector?—Well, he did. At least I asked him, and he told me then. When he asked me was I the person whose name appeared as one of the committee, and he then pointed out two passages objected to, and I said I had no connection with them and that I did not agree with part of the matter contained in them. He asked me to write a letter to himself in the office stating what I had told him. I did so, and on the 17th of June he sent me a long letter of censure signed by himself, and my manager got another letter from the Board ordering him to reprimand me, and the further order was given that I should withdraw from the Education Reform Association. Early in December Mr. Chambers, Inspector, called on me to see if I had severed my connection as ordered, and on my replying in the affirmative he asked me to write a letter to him to that effect. On the 4th of December

I wrote the letter to Mr. Chambers saying that I had tendered my resignation to the Committee of the Education Reform Association at its first meeting after receiving the Board's order and would not again join it so long as I was a National teacher in active service.

17394. Mr. CARRER.—Have you Mr. Hynes's letter?—Yes. Mr. Hynes had no business to reprimand me as I got an official reprimand from the Board.

17395. Mr. HENLY.—Does not a reprimand always contain in the end of the document the word "reprimand"?—Yes, an official reprimand from the Board. After Mr. Hynes had asked me about my own connection with the committee he pointed to Mr. Boyd's name and asked me was he a teacher. I knew he was aware of Mr. Boyd's identity, and I said yes. He then asked me where Mr. Boyd taught, and I told him. He next asked, "Are there any other teachers on the committee?" Foulkes was from the way he acted in Mr. Boyd's case that he did not know any others, I looked at him and asked him did he want me to turn informer. He asked no more questions. I mentioned in a speech I made at Galway that I had been asked to turn informer, and the manager of my Irish school got the following letter from one of the Secretaries of the Board of National Education dated the 16th of April, 1906:—"Co. Down, Madrid Street, Harvey Meml. N.S., L. 94 (1906), C.I., Roll No. 14,020. Office of National Education, 19th April, 1906. Sir, I am directed to inform you that attention has been called to a report appearing in the Dublin *Irish* of the 13th inst., of an address delivered at a meeting of the Irish National Teachers' Organisation on that day by Mr. David Elliott, principal of the above named school, in which the following passage occurs:—'If there is one character more detestable than all others in the eyes of true Irishmen it is that of informer, and yet I have been asked by a Chief Inspector to turn informer on other teachers.' With reference to this passage I am to request that you will be so good as to state, after consultation with Mr. Elliott, whether he has been correctly reported." I had left the service of the Board then, and the gentleman who had been my manager showed me the letter, and I said, "You can send them my address and they can deal with me whatever way they like." They did not deal with me after that and there was a question asked in the House of Commons. I was then out of the service of the Board, and if I had been in the service of the Board Mr. Hynes or some other body would like to give me another reprimand, but when I was retired they refused to answer the question in the House of Commons and said it would not be in the interest of education to answer those questions.

17396. Mr. KERRIN.—Is that a correct report of that passage in your speech?—Yes, it is a correct report.

17397. There is another matter that you want to mention?—Yes, that is about Mr. McElwaine.

17398. The BRISTOL or ROSE.—We have got on our notes now something about this pamphlet, "Control of Secular Education"?—Yes.

17399. I presume the pamphlet advocated secular control of secular education?—Yes.

17400. And setting aside clerical managers?—Yes, and it was written, I may tell your lordship, by a very strong partisan of secular control.

17401. And that was the drift of it?—Yes.

17402. And you supplied the portion dealing with the managerial question?—With the managerial question only.

17403. And the drift, I presume, was to set up a secular control as against clerical control?—Well, I did not interfere with the principle of clerical management. I supplied the information, and most of the cases were clerical cases.

17404. The CHAIRMAN.—Did you write that portion of it yourself, or did you only supply the information?—Well, I supplied the information almost in the words in which they printed it.

17405. With regard to the action of clerical managers?—Yes.

17th July, 1913.]

Mr. DAVID ELLIOTT, B.A., examined.

[Continued.]

17355. Mr. KERRIN.—Was the advocacy of secular as against clerical control, as you put it, of schools, an essential part of the programme of the Education Reform Association?—Well, it was the principal part, but not an essential part. It was not with that idea that I joined the association. My idea was to improve education in every way.

17357. The Bishop of Ross.—I infer that the "Irish Protestant Union of Teachers" hold the same opinion, do they not?—Very largely.

17358. Because I find a statement in this pamphlet with which you have kindly supplied us, the "Irish Protestant National Teachers' Annual," 1910?—Yes.

17359. I see here in that pamphlet a statement in which it deplores that "a wedge was driven into the ranks of the Irish teachers, and the majority, bought off with a sham settlement, consented to abandon the minority"?—Yes.

17360. Well, the sham settlement mentioned there was the Mayo settlement resolutions?—Yes, that is what it there meant evidently.

17361. Well, if it does not bear that meaning I am anxious to know what it does?—I believe it bears that meaning.

17362. It says, "The majority, bought off with a sham settlement, consented to abandon the minority." Those were the Catholic teachers who on this managerial question abandoned the Protestant teachers, that is on the question of clerical versus lay management?—Yes.

17363. Mr. KERRIN.—Then you want to speak about your relations with Inspector McElwaine?—Well, I wish to say that he was the only inspector that was ever really rude to me, and he was exceedingly rude. He came between half-past two and three o'clock in the day. It was a very wet, cold day and the children had brought in on their feet dirt, or rather mud, and, of course, during the day that mud dried on the floor and became dust. It was such a cold day that I did not force the children out to eat their lunch in the yard, and little pieces of paper fell and some crumbs of bread and the paper that wrapped it. After play time I sent two boys that lifted every particle of paper and piece of bread that could be lifted, and there was only the dust and small crumbs of bread that could not be lifted; and he came and he looked at me and said in a cross manner, "the floor is very dirty," and I said, "It was brushed last night and dusted this morning, and those are rules," and he then turned on me and in the very roughest way said, "If you don't take orders from me I will get them sent from the Commissioners." But he had no more right to give orders to me than I had to give orders to him, and I said, "Well, you can do so," and then he got quite into a rage, and discussed business with me for a long time, but finally he went out in a rage again and did not take the least notice of any person in the room. He reported me for using most offensive language, and then I inquired what the offensive language was, and he had to admit that he said that he would get orders sent from the Board; and the correspondence lasted for a year and ended with the death of the manager, and the last letter stated that if the manager was willing to let the matter drop, on account of my lengthened and satisfactory service, the Commissioners were willing to let it drop.

17364. The CHAIRMAN.—That was the only instance in which you experienced personal discourtesy?—Yes. I think you asked Mr. Todd in how many cases out of about 80 schools they had lost money; and Mr. Todd and I went over the list and looked into it as carefully as we could, and we found that 46 had lost money by the lowering of these reports.

17365. Mr. KERRIN.—They had failed to obtain increments?—Yes. There are 50 cases on this sheet,* and Mr. Todd and I went over them as carefully as we could, and we made out that 46 of the 80 lost money by the lowering of the reports.

17366. Mr. HENRY.—So that while your schools were alleged to be going up?—The money was going down. Mr. Todd was asked for the number of teachers on this list who had lost money by the reduc-

tion of reports. He was unable to give the number at the time, and he promised that he would endeavor to send it up by some other witness; and now I give to the number as made out by Mr. Todd and myself with the greatest care that we possibly could, and there are 46 cases of loss of money on account of the lowering of reports out of 80.

17367. In your process you complain of the fact that teachers have to print lessons on the blackboard for infants?—They have abolished the tablets or cards in infant schools and they insist on the teachers printing on the blackboard whatever they wish the infants to read. I do not see for the life of me the object of abolishing the proper printing and giving the children bad printing by the teacher, and it is a waste of time.

17368. But is not the object there to put an actual event before the eyes of the children and then get the pupils to make a statement of it, and then get that statement printed, so that from the beginning the children will have a clear grasp of what those words denote?—Yes, that might do for a lesson occasionally, but as I understand they do not permit them to use the tablets at all.

17369. But surely you do not object to teaching reading in such a fashion that the children will grasp what they read?—Not in such a fashion that they do not understand what they read.

17370. Mr. KERRIN.—You have told us that you have a very wide experience of and acquaintance with National teachers, a very wide experience of the whole system?—Yes.

17371. Can you tell this Committee whether there is an atmosphere of satisfaction existing amongst the teachers in these parts of the country that you know best?—There is an atmosphere of intense dissatisfaction all over the country that I know.

17372. That includes what districts in particular?—Well, especially the North, but I am coming in contact with teachers from all parts of Ireland.

17373. The CHAIRMAN.—I suppose the North is the district you know best?—Well, I am most in contact with the North; of course, but I am coming in contact with teachers and get communications from teachers from all parts of Ireland.

17374. Mr. KERRIN.—You speak with special knowledge of the North?—I speak with special knowledge of the North. On Saturday week I was at a big meeting of teachers in Portrush. Now, I saw that some of the officials of the Board had stated in evidence before you (it appears in your first book of evidence) that the dissatisfaction was not widespread, and I said to this large meeting, consisting of teachers from the County Antrim and the County Derry—I put it to them, "Are you satisfied?", and they answered with an unanimous "No."

17375. The CHAIRMAN.—What was the size of the meeting?—I should say it would be from 150 to 200 representatives of all parts of the counties.

17376. Mr. HENRY.—As far as you know from your action as Treasurer of the Organisation is that dissatisfaction universal?—It is universal.

17377. The CHAIRMAN.—And you say that the North is as dissatisfied as the South?—Quite as dissatisfied.

17378. Someone said to me the other day that Belfast was more rebellious than the South?—Well, I heard it in the House of Commons this way, that some of them said they had only a Tipperary revolt on their hands, and I told them that the rebellion commenced in Belfast.

17379. Have you any more cases?—You have numbered six cases here out of thirteen. There are fourteen selected coming up. I know Mr. Kyle, he is a hard working teacher and a good teacher, and he has been by one means or other kept out from getting any increment or promotion. Briefly, here is his case. In 1903 he got "very good," then "good," then "very good," then "very good," then "very good," then "very good," then "very good," and then it comes down to 1910, and he gets "good," and that keeps him out of promotion.

* Vide Appendix XLVII.

17th July, 1918.]

Mr. DAVID KENNEDY, B.A., examined.

[Continued.]

17360. Mr. HENRY.—He got a school of 30 pupils in 1866, nearly all infants, under the results' system, and the fee for infants was about 2s., and therefore the results fee that he could earn would be very small, but the school went on increasing and then the consolidated salaries were fixed on the average salaries of the last three years ending 1900, but in Mr. Kyle's case it was so manifestly unjust that they took the last year and excluded the other two, and still as his school went on increasing from 30 up to its present size, 140 or 150, this consolidated salary, fixed on the last year of the results, 1900, did not give him the fair salary that he would be entitled to—I want to bring this before you and to tell Mr. Kyle that I have brought it before you. The next case is Mr. Heenan's of Crossgar. Mr. Heenan got four "excellent" and then "very good" and then Mr. Dewar came in 1907 and reduced him to "good," and he has been kept at "good" ever since by Mr. McMillan, and kept out of promotion. He was reduced from "excellent" to "good" in 1903 and "very good" in 1908, and was reduced by Mr. Dewar, who came in 1909, to "good." Then there is the case of Mr. Scott, of McClure Street. He was in a small school near Killbeg. He got a "very good" report there for a certain number of years, but he could get no promotion on account of the average, and he got a school in McClure Street in 1910, and the first year he got "very good," and then Mr. Dewar came and reduced him to "good" in 1911. Mr. Heenan got "very good" in 1910, and Mr. Dewar in 1911 gave him "good," and Mr. Heenan followed him. Then there is the case of Mr. Morrison. He was in a small school in the country, too, and he got then a larger school, and his case is exactly similar, only that the mark has been going up and down in such a way that he could get no promotion. Then there is case of Miss McNeill, she is from Bally-hadonee. She came from a small country school and she was then first of first class, but she was called what was only an integrade. She remained an integrade for 11 years and then when the attendance went up, till she could qualify for promotion the reports went down, and the only increase that she has got is by coming from a very small school to a larger one and getting a small amount of capitulation. I have been in the school again and again, and I know it is an exceedingly good school, and I have examined the children myself.

17361. The CHAIRMAN.—It is very well located at all events—Oh, it is. It is beside the Catholic church there. It is a Catholic school.

17362. Well, have you done all you propose to do for all those six teachers? I have stated their cases

as briefly as I could to you, and I believe they will be satisfied that I have done them justice.

17363. I do not see that they would gain anything by coming up—I have told them that. There are other cases. There is the case of Mr. Hewitt. He had a very good report where he was, and then he came into a school in a poor locality and he managed to get "good" reports; and there is the case of Mr. Gormley in the same way.

17364. And they do not think that by coming up here they could get any redress?—Oh, no, and I told them that, too, that you could not give them redress. I hope you will put these rejoinders in and the pamphlet on the investigation by Mr. Dewar. I should like the whole account of the investigation and some of the correspondence. The only reason that that has not come up again is that the manager, Mr. Mervyn, is very ill. He is home and he is very ill, and I would not think of taking any action. There is one thing in connection with that case that the Board people dealt very unfairly with us. They sent me a letter, which I think you will find in this pamphlet, to Mr. Mervyn for publication, that he published in his Parochial Magazine, and Mr. Mervyn admitted in his Select Vestry that he got another letter that he never showed to anybody.

17365. Another letter from the Board?—Yes, and I do not know whether you applied to the Board for that letter or not, but we did not get it, and I think that you should have it. It is a letter addressed to Mr. Mervyn in which (as I understand and have very good reason to believe) they did not approve of his conduct in the matter of the inquiry.

17366. The CHAIRMAN.—A letter from the Board to Mr. Mervyn expressing disapproval of his conduct in the matter required into by Mr. Dewar. That has been applied for and it has been refused—I looked on it as a very serious matter that they should send one reply to be published virtually treating him from all blame, and then send another letter, as I understand, blaming him.

17367. You know what the contents of the second letter were?—Well, I never saw it, but I have reason to know. As a matter of fact, Mr. Mervyn had given verbal notice to two teachers the time he got this second letter, and then he asked them would they mention it, and they said "No," and he said "You need not trouble any more about it."

17368. Who were those teachers?—Mr. Todd, who was here, and Mr. Moore, of Shankinstown.

17369. He mentioned this case here?—I know he did.

THIRTY-EIGHTH DAY.—FRIDAY, 18TH JULY, 1918

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

PRESENT:—Sir SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (CHAIRMAN); The Most Rev. DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross; Sir HIRAM SLAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN COFFEY; Mr. HENKAGE; E. B. HARRISON, B.A.; Mr. JEREMIAH HENLY; Mr. WALTER McMURDOUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.; Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL KETTLER, D.L.; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Mr. H. E. CARTER, B.A., Principal of Ormeau Road National School, Belfast, examined.

17390. The CHAIRMAN.—What is the school of which you are principal?—The Ormeau Road School, Belfast.

17391. And how long have you been in the service of the National Board?—Forty years.

17392. You do not look like that, but it is a very healthy occupation. How long have you been in your present school?—Twenty-nine years.

17393. And were you principal of any school before that?—Yes, sir, Warehouse School, close to Belfast.

17394. How long were you principal of that?—One year.

17395. Had you any school before that?—Before that I was Principal of Northumberland Male National School, Belfast.

17396. Was that all?—I was for a short time in Brown Street School, Belfast, as an assistant.

17397. What is the size of the Ormeau Road School?—Four assistants and an average of 185. That is the senior school.

17398. I see you have put down seven different subjects on which you wish to say something. Now, you will not misunderstand me when I tell you that on every one of these subjects we have had an immense mass of evidence, and I think I may say that on a good many of them the minds of most of us are pretty clear, so that I think you will probably not need to dilate at very great length upon them. But before I begin on those topics may I ask you are you one of the principal teachers who have complaints against the method of inspection since 1906?—Yes.

17399. Did you join the Deputation to Dr. Starkie?—I did not, sir.

17400. But did you join in the memorial?—I did, because although my school was only reduced from "excellent" to "very good," yet I felt some of the remarks that were made in my observation book very keenly. I have the observation book here and can point to some of those; and I do not think that the present system of inspection is at all conducive to good education.

17401. I see that is one of your topics?—That is one of my points.

17402. I want to find as to your personal history, what complaints you have to make of inspectors in your district?—Well, I do not wish to make a complaint of any individual inspector, because I believe that the inspectors would not act as they have done if they had not high official sanction for their action.

17403. That is the opinion of your brethren in Belfast?—Well, that is my personal opinion.

17404. Is it also theirs?—I do not know.

17405. In fact, they said it is to the Resident Commissioner on the deputation, and it is in print. But you have not suffered in status or in emolument by reason of the mode of inspection in Belfast?—No, sir, except with regard to extra subjects. I have that noted.

17406. How far have the results of inspection in your district affected you?—I have only obtained full fees for one extra subject since 1908.

17407. How has that arisen?—From the difficulty of the examination.

17408. Then it is inspection?—In algebra and geometry I have only obtained full fees in 1911; and I wish to submit some of the questions that were set. That is the first year paper. (Document handed in.) That I consider too difficult.

17409. What other extra subject?—Geometry. Those are all I wish to deal with.

17410. Were the questions outside of your programme?—No, sir; but they are questions that are entirely against the spirit of modern mathematical teaching.

17411. That is to say, they apply a different method of teaching from that you pursued?—They set questions which would take the junior children very long to work. The tendency at present, and according to the recommendations of the Mathematical Association, is to give very short questions until the children get acquainted with the methods and processes—in fact, until they see the use of the subject.

17412. What were the ages of the pupils that these papers were set to?—About 11 or 12.

17413. What standard?—Fifth standard.

17414. That is all you have to say about the loss from the extra subjects?—That is all.

17415. You had boys in higher standards in such a school as that?—Yes, in fifth, sixth and seventh standard.

17416. And how did this style of examining affect them?—Well, the children felt discouraged.

17417. The Birmer or Ross?—In sixth and seventh standards you have a different programme?—We have different questions.

17418. The CHAIRMAN.—And have you the same complaint to make of these questions?—Yes.

17419. So that the children in all these standards taking these subjects suffered?—Yes.

17420. What would be the amount of your pecuniary

loss compared with previous years?—During six years the total loss would be about £40.

17421. Since 1908?—Since 1908.

17422. Have you any other complaint to make about the mode of inspection in your particular district?—Only with regard to some of the observations in the Observation Book.

17423. Will you mind reading one, or at most two, of the observations?—Well, in 1906, there is an observation that is not so much objectionable as useless.

17424. I thought they were objectionably worded?—No; I do not wish to make any charge of that kind. In 1906 the senior inspector in charge of the district, Mr. Dewar, said the lessons given by the principal in algebra and geometry were most defective. In the succeeding year he also put algebra and geometry as being satisfactory, but in the following year, 1908, I got to hear at all.

17425. What was the observation on that?—The observation was that the sixth class was backward in easy problem work. I have a copy of the problems set. I felt that remark more than perhaps any other, because it seemed as if arithmetic was not being taught, whereas I consider that it was as well taught as ever it had been in my school.

17426. Have you any other observation?—No, sir; only to observe with regard to the extra subjects that there are some useless questions in those set on the paper in algebra—substitution questions. The questions in which substitutions are given are very often of a meaningless character. The tendency in modern teaching is to give as substitution questions formulae that will occur afterwards, such as formulae for measurement, mechanical formulae, and so on. Those formulae are used in nearly all modern books, and it is very much more successful, because children afterwards recognise those when they get them in actual work, and they are quite as useful substitutions, and far more useful practically than questions such as those in No. 6.

17427. Mr. CARTER.—In what standard were these problems in arithmetic?—Sixth standard.

17428. The Birmer or Ross?—Do A, B and C indicate alternative questions?—Those are questions set in different years. The first year paper was set in 1908. The second paper, B, set out there is an example of a fair paper. I got full fees on that paper in 1911. The other three questions I consider are too long work for children; they are not a fair test.

17429. The CHAIRMAN.—Is that all you wish to tell us about the Observation Book?—No. Many of the observations in the Observation Book contain suggestions, but those suggestions are very often of such a vague character as to be practically useless.

17430. Will you read one or two of them?—In 1911 Mr. Dewar, the senior inspector, reports that "the teachers are painstaking and assiduous, and aim at the cultivation of the intelligence. Proficiency is, on the whole, very satisfactory, but more care might be given to arithmetic." That is, the teachers are painstaking and assiduous, and are doing their best, and yet he says more care might be given to arithmetic.

17431. He means generally assiduous, but that in arithmetic there was a little want of something?—And he says the children should be taught to explain the different processes in the work; that they should be taught to understand the reasons underlying the rules and the processes employed. Now, we were doing that to the very best of our ability, and still he says that more care might be given to arithmetic, and yet he does not give any explanation whatever of how that can be done. We do not know what is in his mind; we do not know what he intends—the object that he intends to accomplish.

17432. Now, when he has completed his inspection, does he talk to you on those subjects?—Very rarely.

17433. Do you get advice or assistance from him in conversation?—I think in all my forty years' experience (because my objection to the inspection system does not date only from 1906) the relations between teachers and inspectors have never been satisfactory.

17434. My question is, have you ever got advice from inspectors in conversation?—I have got from

two inspectors valuable help, but from no others in all my career. One of these was the late John McCollum, a man who, although he was not a practical educationalist, kept his eyes open going round the school.

17435. He was a man of the old regime?—He was.
17436. But from the inspectors of the present day you do not get much help?—I have only got help from one of late years, in 1902, from Mr. Ross.

17437. Now, would that cover all that you think important to bring before us as to the methods of inspection that you are acquainted with in your own district?—Well, that is all.

17438. Then I go on to other topics that you have down. Now, your first is inspection and examination, especially with reference to the teaching of mathematics. That is the subject that we have been dealing with?—Yes.

17439. I suppose you have already said all that was necessary on that?—I think so, practically.

17440. Now you say (and this is a point that I want you to explain) that examination is the only method at present adopted of testing schools. Now, would you develop that, and tell us what you mean by those words?—I have a letter from the National Board which says, "that the question of fees for mathematics is not governed by percentages; but that if the instruction is considered effective and the progress of the pupils is satisfactory, a grant of the full fee for each member of the class in bona fide attendance may be made. If the soundness and quality of the instruction do not reach the standard 'good,' but the standard 'fair,' only a half fee per pupil in bona fide attendance may be made. If the instruction falls below the standard 'fair,' no award of fees can be made."

17441. What is the meaning of those words?—"Examination is the only method at present adopted of testing?"—This letter seems to indicate that it does not depend upon examination, but inspection really.

17442. Your point is that it ought to be examination only for which fees should be granted?—No, that is not my point. The letter here from the Board appears to indicate that inspection is the method of testing schools, whereas the inspectors are at present examining them in the regular results' style—calculating percentages, and making the results of the examination depend entirely on the result of the attainments in the matter of percentages.

17443. I suppose the meaning is this, that the practice of the inspectors is against the spirit of that letter of the Board?—That is my point.

17444. The CHAIRMAN or ROSS.—And you want the inspectors to follow out their instructions?—Yes.

17445. The CHAIRMAN.—Would you like the inspectors to follow the spirit of that letter?—I think that the whole question is that if the inspectors followed closely the instructions set out for them in 1902 with regard to their dealing with teachers, there would not be much cause of complaint on the part of the teachers.

17446. You like the instructions that were sent out in 1902?—Yes; they are very fair and very reasonable.

17447. And you do agree with them?—I do agree with them; and if inspectors had carried them out we would have had very little cause of complaint.

17448. That is valuable evidence. Then you say that your great complaint is that so many of the inspectors are not following the spirit of the instructions issued in 1902?—Yes, that is my statement.

17449. And with those instructions you yourself agree?—Largely. For instance, in the revised instructions to inspectors in 1902 one feature of the revised programme was freedom of school organisation. That was one point, and the substitution of heuristic for didactic instruction was another. Now the heuristic method, though it may not be found successful on all subjects, may be a very useful method, but the method of examination at present leads directly to the didactic method, and the cramming system.

17450. In fact, what they alleged against the old results' system?—Yes.

17451. I understand you to say that the present system of inspection is liable to the same criticism as the old results' system, in your experience?—Yes, exactly. The examinations are being conducted on very much the same lines as the old results' system examination.

17452. Does that apply only to certain subjects or does it apply over the whole range?—It applies specially to the teaching of arithmetic and other written work. But as a rule, geography is not examined in writing at present, and, in fact, it never was examined, even under the results' system.

17453. With regard to arithmetic, we have had it in evidence again and again that under the new system (whatever you may think of it in other respects) arithmetic is one of the subjects that have suffered, that the children do not know it so accurately, and, consequently, men of business complain of their new apprentices?—Yes.

17454. Do you agree with that?—To some extent. Arithmetic is a subject which ought to be taught intelligently. The children ought to know the reasons of the rules as far as possible. They spend a great deal of time on explanation of processes. There is not the time to produce mechanical accuracy, so that the children are not today able to pass an examination so well as they formerly were under the results' system; but recently we have been adopting the method of giving tests and fitting them for examination on account of the inspectors' style.

17455. So the inspectors are altering your style of teaching?—They are, practically.

17456. And they are going back on the old style?—On the old style of examination almost entirely.

17457. Does that remark apply to all the inspectors or to the majority of them?—I should say to the majority.

17458. Now we may go on. You say the teachers are dissatisfied with the present system of inspection. Can you give us the reasons why, in your opinion, the teachers do not appeal when they are dissatisfied with the result of an inspection?—Well, I have never known a teacher to appeal who ever made anything of it. If he were successful in his appeal, it is almost the same, as he would be a marked man afterwards.

17459. How many cases of appeal have you in your mind now?—I have one recent case, and the other case is under the results' system.

17460. That is a case in which a complaint went up to the Board about a certain award of merit marks?—Yes.

17461. What happened then?—The school was re-examined by the senior inspector, and the merit mark was confirmed that had been given by the junior inspector.

17462. And the teacher heard no more about that appeal?—The teacher heard no more about it.

17463. That is one reason why teachers do not appeal. Is there any other reason?—There is the idea that the inspectors have a very serious weapon in their hand, that is, that they have the power to report on the personal merit mark of the teacher; and it is felt that, perhaps, some inspectors might use that as a weapon against a teacher who had gone so far as to appeal against him.

17464. Can you say with any certainty that that has been the result of a teacher's appeal?—I cannot say.

17465. It is only a matter of suspicion?—It is only a matter of suspicion; but it is a fact that the teachers do not know their personal merit mark.

17466. It is said that they do not know, but they find it out. Do you not know yours?—I do not, sir. I do not know a single mark I ever got.

17467. Some people tell us that the teachers do somehow go to know?—Well, with regard to an assistant of mine, who was expecting promotion recently to second grade, this lady went to one of the Commissioners, and the Commissioner got this note from the office:—"Miss Jane Boyd, assistant teacher, second class, untrained, is in receipt of maximum salary, third grade, from 1st April, 1906. All the reports on her work for the past seven years, with one

18th July, 1913.]

Mr. H. E. CARTER, B.A., examined.

[Continued.]

exception, have been 'very good.' The question of awarding promotion to the second grade is under consideration." It has been under consideration now for a long time.

17468. Have you any other reasons to give?—That lady is an excellent teacher, and it says there that she had "very good" in all years except one. Now I can only attribute that to one year when she was absent at the time of the annual inspection, and I suspect that that is the one year in which she had not "very good." Now, if we knew what year that occurred in we should be able to right a thing which is wrong. I believe she has been penalised through the fact of her being ill at the time of the annual inspection.

17469. And that is how the concealment of the personal merit mark affects the interests of the teacher?—Yes, that is my point.

17470. Mr. KAVANAGH.—How could they award a merit mark to a person who is absent?—I think she got no mark during that year.

Mr. HENRY.—The merit mark is on her work for the whole year.

17471. The CHAIRMAN.—Still, again, here we have a case not of natural fact, but of suspicion?—We cannot get anything else with regard to this personal merit mark. We do not know.

17472. Give us any other reason, if you please?—That is practically all.

17473. Have you any suggestion to make about how the appeal ought to go, and how it ought to be dealt with in the office if it does go—have you made up your mind about that?—I have not, Sir Samuel.

17474. Now we go on to a subject on which we have endless evidence, that increments should be annual and automatic, and the Lord Bishop has brought before us a scheme which has been put before various witnesses, and on which they one and all agreed. They think that it would be very desirable, and I am not sure that some of the authorities of the Board also are not favourable to it; but we need not go into that unless you have something new yourself to say about it?—No, sir, I have nothing new.

17475. Now would you say that the teacher should have a higher initial salary and smaller increment?—I should say a higher initial salary and higher increment.

17476. But we have to proceed on the supposition that the grant is a fixed quantity, and the Lord Bishop here drew up the scheme on that basis?—I think I saw that scheme.

17477. The BRANCO or ROSS.—That scheme that you saw was a first rough attempt. It would leave the teacher's maximum salary in his grade smaller than it had been, and a teacher who might continue several years in any particular grade would be penalised, and, of course, that would be a serious defect; but that was only drawn up roughly, in reply to a suggestion of Mr. McNeill, the Chief Inspector. The new system I draw up leaves the teacher in each grade either at the same maximum salary that they reach at present or a salary a little higher. You see I also start the third grade with a higher salary than they begin with at present; and to carry out both these purposes, and not to exceed the total grant (I do exceed slightly the total grant), in some of the intermediate years they must get less than they get at present. You quite follow that?

Mr. HENRY.—I think your lordship commences with \$69.

17478. The BRANCO or ROSS.—I commence with \$69, and the idea is this. At present they commence with \$63, and they get an increment at the end of three years. I start them with \$69, and I keep them for seven years at \$69, that is, one year more than at present. Of course, in that seventh year they suffer, but you cannot have it every way. So then I start with an annual increment of \$3 at the end of seven years?—I see.

And at the end of their eleventh year they get \$84. In some of the intermediate years, especially the ninth and tenth, they have less under my system than they would have under the other. But that is the

general principle—\$69 for seven years as against \$63 for three years and \$70 for three years, and then to get an annual increment of \$3, reaching \$84. And then, in the second grade, I start them a little lower in that scheme, and give them \$3 increment. The increments are continued up all along, and the mere arithmetic of the system would show a slight saving, but that slight saving would be more than counterbalanced by the fact that young women who join the service and change their minds and leave the service and retire or die, would all have been paid higher sums of money in their earlier years than people are paid at present, and when they go out they take away more public money than they take at present; so that if I have a slight margin it would be carried by them and more than carried away, but on the whole, I think the difference to the Treasury would not be so very great. There would be some very little increase probably.

17479. The CHAIRMAN.—Now you have heard his lordship's explanation, and on the basis of the present grant from the Government, do you think that would be better than the present system?—Yes, I think it would be very much more satisfactory.

17480. Now, this statement of yours implies the abolition absolutely of these merit marks?—It does.

17481. I do not intend to go into that, and now I go on to the next point that inspectors should have experience in teaching and a more prolonged and effective training in inspection work. You know, I suppose, that 22 out of the 76 inspectors on the present staff had been National teachers. Do you know that?—Yes, I do.

17482. Would you extend that much, would you have a larger number of National teachers?—I would say that inspectors should have had teaching experience, but not necessarily in National schools.

17483. But some teaching experience?—Some teaching experience.

17484. Would you require of the candidate inspector that he should show that he had some experience in teaching either in a primary or secondary school?—I would.

17485. Now, as to more prolonged and effective training in inspection work, I suppose you know what we have had a good deal of evidence about, the mode in which probationers are trained at present for one year, for a six months' period at first and then for another six?—Yes.

17486. They are sent out to act under an inspector?—Yes.

17487. And would you alter that?—I really think that if the inspection system is to be continued there must be a regular training school.

17488. With lectures on method?—With lectures on method, and placed in charge of experts in education and inspection work.

17489. Would you recommend that a school of education should be established here for the training of probationer inspectors?—I would.

Mr. HENRY.—They were taken up for a short time to be trained in elementary science.

17490. You would require candidates who were university students to have an educational training for it?—Yes, sir; and practice in actual inspection. Of course, this is a matter that teachers themselves are very often deficient in, namely, the art of questioning. It is possible to question in such a way that children won't answer.

17491. You find that frequently?—You find that frequently—I have met it time after time. A question has been asked by an inspector in a class and has not been answered, and I have asked the same question immediately after, not in the presence of the inspector, because he really would resent the question being repeated after him, but I have immediately afterwards the class the same question, and have got an answer from the majority.

17492. That was on account of the different mode in which you put it?—The different mode in which it is put. It requires special training, I think, to ask questions, and that should be part of the training which the inspector should get—training in the art of questioning.

28th July, 1918.]

Mr. H. E. CARTER, B.A., examined.

[Continued]

17486. I suppose your argument would be that inspectors are not as well trained in the method as the better teachers are?—I quite agree.

17487. Mr. HENRY.—Would it meet your difficulty if in all those cases the teacher had an opportunity of questioning his own class himself in presence of the inspector—as a supplementary part of the inspector's examination?—It would, to some extent; I think to a large extent.

17495. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you anything now to add to that training in inspection work that you have not already stated to us?—No; but I have a suggestion to make with regard to the relations between teachers and inspectors. I think I have said already that in my opinion the relations between the two have never been satisfactory in my forty years' experience, except in two cases, in which I have got practical help from two inspectors. I think that if effectual work is to be done the inspectors must come into closer touch with the teachers than ever they have done.

17496. In what way?—Well, if an inspector takes up a new district or a new line of education, I think the successful method would be to assemble the teachers, and to give them some idea of what his ideas of education are.

17497. That is, conferences between inspectors and teachers?—Yes.

17498. And you think the inspector ought to make acquaintance with them at the beginning by conferences?—Yes; because if he had a talk with them he would be able to say, perhaps, "There cannot be satisfactory work done unless so and so," and also he will have an opportunity of hearing the teachers' opinions.

17499. And how would he draw forth those opinions?—Well, I think that there ought to be free discussion of his methods and his ideals.

17500. That he should make a statement first, and the teachers should speak about it?—Yes, and even criticism. I have been present at conferences in the Technical Institute in Belfast, in which I teach evening classes in mathematics. I have been present at conferences of the teaching staff there with inspectors of the Department of Agriculture, and I have heard a senior inspector's opinions submitted to very severe criticism from some of the teachers, and he accepted it in good part, and the whole control idea before everybody was how to arrive at the best method of doing the work.

17501. Did that relate to the mode of inspection?—It was principally with regard to the mode of inspection, and more especially with regard to the methods of teaching, and how to secure the best methods of putting matters before classes.

17502. And you have heard inspectors of the Department criticised by teachers under their superintendence?—Yes, I have.

17503. And do you think that would work under the National Board?—It would be useful for the teacher to hear the inspectors' opinions, and sometimes it might be useful for the inspectors to hear the teachers' opinions.

17504. Mr. HENRY.—If you had these conferences would not the teachers simply play up to the inspector and adopt his fads, and thus destroy their own freedom; and would not that prevent any initiative on the part of the teachers?—I do not think so. I do not think that the result of a conference would be that. It should be the advancement of education.

Mr. KERRIE.—Do teachers ever have fads as well as inspectors?

17505. Mr. HENRY.—Have you ever heard of conferences of which what I have suggested might be the result?—That might be the result; but it is not an argument against the use of a thing that it is liable to abuse.

17506. The CHAIRMAN.—You were dealing with the relations between teachers and inspectors. Have you anything more to add in addition to what you have said about these conferences?—No, I have not; only that there always has been in my experience a certain stiffness on the part of the inspectors from the teachers. Nobody knows what the inspectors' ideas on education are until he makes some remarks in the Observation Book. It is very rare that inspectors discuss matters of education with the teachers. That has been my experience.

17507. You further say the present school programme attempts too much. Would you explain what you mean by that?—Well, there are some subjects on the revised programme that I think might be left to higher elementary schools, if we had them, or to the technical school.

17508. What subjects?—Subjects such as elementary science and cookery. I think domestic economy subjects might well be left to the technical department. The difficulty before teachers is to accomplish the amount of work thoroughly that is set them. I hold that it is utterly impossible to teach the revised programmes in its entirety efficiently, and if those two subjects were left out we could devote time to several other subjects that I consider are of more importance.

17509. It rather astonishes me that you should propose to leave out cookery and elementary science, as those are for the artisan class just two of the most important subjects you could have—to have some elementary science for the boys and cookery for the girls. That is my own feeling, so that I am rather startled by your suggestion?—Well, that is my opinion.

17510. Sir HENRY WYLLIE.—A point that occurs to me with regard to that is that although in Belfast you say they can go to the Technical Institute, the question is when they would go to the Technical Institute. You would not suggest that they would go before their age of 14 years is completed?—I would suggest that either the girls should be trained in cookery at the Technical Institute or that centres should be established in a big city like Belfast for the purpose of teaching cookery on proper lines.

17511. How would you work in your time table with regard to that?—Well, that would have to be done after school hours.

17512. The other point that occurred to me was this. Of course, a large city like Belfast has its own problems to solve, but we have the country to consider?—Yes.

The CHAIRMAN.—I did not refer so much to Belfast as to the country towns like Ballymena and Ballymore.

17513. Sir HENRY WYLLIE.—It is quite clear that your proposal with regard to Belfast, taking it after school hours, could not apply to the country generally, because you could not have centres near enough; and even if there were centres, the distance from the ordinary schools to the centres would be too great to admit of their taking this teaching during the same time as they would be taking the ordinary day school; and with regard to the centres, children who had completed their 14 years would not go to those centres in large numbers. You see the difficulty?—I do; I quite appreciate the difficulty.

The BISHOP OF ROSS.—It is impossible in fact. The total money of the department is for all subjects, not for cookery alone; and they could not set up centres through the country, such as you expect. You have made your remark purely with regard to Belfast, where you have a great technical school established, and a great preparatory school, whereas the educational authority has to do with 8,800 schools, the great bulk of which are scattered through the country districts.

17514. The CHAIRMAN.—Even in Belfast, with its magnificent technical school, one of the finest in the three kingdoms, could it do the work you propose for it in the way of elementary science?—I believe it could.

17515. Has it not as much to do as it can do at present, with 4,000 or 5,000 pupils?—If an additional number of pupils attend increased accommodation will be made for them.

17516. Mr. KERRIE.—Does not the present programme in National Schools teach everybody how to cook?—I cannot answer that question, because I have not introduced cookery as yet into my school.

The BISHOP OF ROSS.—I can speak from experience. It does not teach a child to cook, but it turns the child's mind in the proper direction, and interests the child in the subject, which is a much more important thing than the actual teaching. A child at that age is not capable of learning how to cook, but it may interest the child in the work its mother does at home, and so on.

17517. The CHAIRMAN.—There is another thing I might say about cookery. When I go to Ballymacarrett and see the enormous number of small houses there, it seems to me how much more comfortable they might be made, because they have plenty of money, I can tell you, throughout those houses coming in from, perhaps, three or four workers. Now, the girls who ought to learn cookery will not go, except a very small number or in a comparatively small proportion, to a cookery class in the Technical Institute, but they have a fine school at Ballymacarrett, with facilities for learning cookery that every girl must learn; and I do not think that a greater reform could be made among the working classes in a city with an enormous population than to have the girls able to cook a decent chop or steak, and the men would not go into publichouses so much?—I quite agree; but the schoolrooms are not properly equipped, and they have not the proper accommodation.

17518. That is not the fault of the teacher, of course?—In my own school, the Board's inspector found one of the rooms that he said would be suitable. I think there was no place suitable in my school for cookery, but he selected a room which he said was well adapted for the purpose. We applied afterwards, last year, 1912, for a grant. It is a vested school, and the Commissioners would give two-thirds of the cost of the permanent work to be done in connection with the instruction in cookery, but the Board of Works Inspector came down to report on the matter, and he said that it could not possibly be taught in the room which the National Board's Inspector said was a suitable room for it. He selected another room, a room 15 feet by 14, for the instruction of 50 girls in cookery, with a gas stove and all the appliances for cookery also in that small room. He said that was the only room that was suitable for it. That is how the question stands at present, and we cannot take any steps until those two inspectors reconcile their views on the subject as to what place is suitable for the teaching of this subject.

17519. The BRANCO or ROSS.—But in the old days in Ireland where we had no houses to teach in, we taught under the hedge, and if you have not a proper room to teach cookery in at present, you should only do the best you can with the room you have and wait for time to give you a proper room, for the subject is essential?—I was thinking more, of course, of Belfast when I said cookery could be left out.

17520. CHAIRMAN.—You see it then becomes a matter of girls going voluntarily?—I suggested that sooner might be left off, and cookery. I quite recognise, your objection, however, with regard to the cookery, and I believe myself that it ought to be taught to girls, and in connection with school, though not necessarily inside school hours, because we have not time to deal with the whole programme. My principal point was that we must give increased attention to English. I continually found in my classes in the Technical Institute students who failed in catching some point in mathematics simply because they were unable to read intelligently. I think that we ought to aim at having the children in the senior classes able to summarise a paragraph of ordinary English when they leave our National Schools. If we give them that power we would do a great deal for their education, if they were able to read so as to understand and write a piece of an ordinary English passage. Well, if we did that we could save time, because the amount of science which is taught in National Schools during the three years' course could be learned in three months, and if we had a boy sufficiently trained in English to understand an ordinary paragraph—that is, that increased attention to English I think would enable him to do all the work that they do in the three years' course in a very much shorter time.

17521. Do I understand you to say that the teaching of English under this new system in the last 13 years has improved or gone back?—I would not say it has not improved, but I would say that it has not improved sufficiently. I would go so far as to say that the teaching of English has never been thoroughly satisfactory in our schools.

17522. And it is not better, you think, under the new system than it was under the old?—I do not think it is.

17523. You know they have laid great stress on the teaching of English?—I am aware of that.

17524. That is in their programme?—Well, I do not think that there is very much improvement on a well-taught pupil under the routine system.

17525. Mr. HENRY.—Have you ever submitted a modified programme?—I have not.

17526. Well, if the programme is too extensive for you have the right of doing so?—That is so.

17527. The CHAIRMAN.—What is to prevent you from submitting a modified programme?—Well, I have always a feeling that the inspector does not like these modified programmes.

17528. Have any of your colleagues submitted programmes?—I am not aware.

17529. Mr. HENRY.—What is that feeling based on, may I ask?—Well, I could not give you the reason—only that inspectors are so much aloof from the teachers that we cannot get to know what is their opinion with regard to that.

17530. The CHAIRMAN.—Are you afraid that the inspector would not accept your proposal?—I fear that the examination in some subjects would be made more difficult if we made a diminution in the other requirements.

17531. In fact, that it would be made hot for you?—Well, I have no ground for saying so, but that is the feeling among the teachers.

17532. Have you finished that point about extra subjects?—Yes.

17533. Then we may go to a point on which we have had a good deal of evidence, in reference to the expense of working schools being often borne by the teacher?—If you wish, before leaving cookery, to know something of the methods by which the Commissioners try to secure the introduction of cookery into all schools I may have a letter, which I can read to you, which practically threatens the teacher's increment if cookery was not introduced into our schools.

17534. Then will you read it?—Office of National Education, Dublin, 18th December, 1909.—I am directed to inform you that the question of awarding an increment of good service salary to Miss Marise C. Roddie, assistant teacher in the above-named school, is at present under consideration, and in connection therewith I am to draw your attention to the terms of Rule 125 (1), with reference to the teaching of cookery and laundry work, and to the following statement in the introduction to the programme of instruction for National Schools for the school year 1908-9, viz., "Cookery and laundry work must be taught as part of the ordinary school programme to girls enrolled in the fifth and higher standards when suitable provision for instruction in these subjects can be secured. Increments may be withheld from the teaching staff of such a school if cookery is not taught, unless special sanction for the omission of the subject from the school course have been granted." As it is observed that cookery has not yet been taken up in the Ormeau Road National School, I am to request you to be good enough to state what steps you are taking to provide instruction in this subject for the girls attending the school. It was understood from the inspector's report of his visit to the school on the 18th and 19th March, 1905, that you were taken steps to have this subject introduced in the current school year." The inspector had no warrant for making that statement I may say. They had previously to that stated that they could not sanction the omission of the subject of cookery from the programme, so that we took that as being a direct threat that Miss Roddie's increment would be withdrawn if we had not cookery introduced.

17535. The BRANCO or ROSS.—They only quoted the rule?—Yes, but they applied it to a special instance.

17536. But were they not bound to call your attention to the rule when the rule was not being carried out?—Yes; but I think it was hardly reasonable to threaten the withdrawal of increment from the teacher because a manager has not supplied the materials with which to teach cookery.

28th July, 1913.]

Mr. H. E. CARTER, B.A., examined.

[Continued.]

17537. That the room was not fitted up?—That the room was not fitted up, and that there were no facilities for the teaching of cookery. I consider it very unfair to threaten to withdraw the increment from this teacher on that ground.

The BISHOP or BROS.—Well, of course, if the teaching of cookery was to be delayed till there was a special room fitted up, I am afraid there would be no cookery taught in many parts of the country.

17538. Mr. KAVANAGH.—You said that before the manager?—It came to the manager.

17539. And did he carry out what you wished?—I explained that we had proceeded in the matter, and that the Inspector of the Board of Works and the Inspector of the National Board differed with regard to the room.

17540. The CHAIRMAN.—Now about the expense being thrown on teachers. You know cases where teachers have to bear expenses?—Yes.

17541. Have you to bear them or had you to bear them?—I have to bear expenses since 1898, but not before that.

17542. You have had to bear expenses that ought to have been thrown on the manager?—On the district or on the manager.

17543. What were those for?—The working expenses of the school, such as for cleaning and heating. The better off children give some subscriptions, but the subscriptions are rarely sufficient to cover the expenses of the heating, and the teachers supplement that.

17544. The heating is partly paid for by the Government?—Yes.

17545. It does not cover the whole expense?—It does not, but it comes pretty close, and a grant has been made recently by the Church with which I am connected to help in this matter; so the matter of which I have been speaking, that is, that the teachers have to bear the expense, is not so pressing now as it was previously.

17546. The BISHOP or BROS.—Does the Church give pound for pound—does it give as much as the Government grant?—No, not quite.

17547. Which of the Churches?—The Methodist.

17548. We had it in evidence that the Church of Ireland passed a resolution, and also the Presbyterian Church, to give pound for pound, but that the Methodist Church declined to pass any resolution, so they have not bound themselves?—They have acted in place of passing a resolution.

17549. They have not given pound for pound apparently?—Not quite; but they have given to the extent of their ability.

17550. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you any expense to bear yourself now?—No. Since 1898 I have paid over £130 for the expenses of the school in which I am working.

17551. Mr. HARRISON.—Would that include the supply of apparatus?—No, sir, it would not.

17552. Mr. KUTLER.—That would be 28 a year?—Yes.

17553. The CHAIRMAN.—You were going to read something more?—I do not know whether it would come under the terms of reference. This is an agreement that was presented to me in 1896 by the then manager of the school. A new room had been built, and when we went into this new room it was proposed to me that the expense not only of the caretaker, the cleaning and all that sort of thing, but also the expense of repairs and all other expenses, should be borne by the teacher. That was never completed.

17554. About what time was that?—1893. This begins, "Memorandum of Agreement."

17555. The BISHOP or BROS.—Give the effective clauses?—It never was carried out.

17556. The teachers declined to sign it?—We agreed on certain conditions to sign it afterwards, but the conditions were never fulfilled, and it was never signed; but at the same time it was effective to a certain extent in laying expenses on the teachers. The clauses are:—1. That the principal teachers shall be responsible for the cost of the caretaking and cleaning of the above-named schools. 2. That the principal teachers shall be responsible for the lighting and

heating of said premises. 3. That the principal teachers shall be responsible for making good all damages arising from carelessness and neglect or any other cause whatsoever, such as breakage of panes of glass, locks, door handles, latches; all plumbing work in water-closets, outside and inside; all damage done to window fittings of whatsoever kind; all damage done to furniture, including tables, desks, chairs, forms, presses, locks and doors of the same; all damage done to gully traps in connection with water channels in the playground and yard; all damage done to water-taps in playgrounds or yards, or damage arising from such water-taps being injured, ordnance to any other part of the premises not mentioned herein. 4. That the heating apparatus shall be maintained in perfect working order. 5. That the schools shall be washed out at least once a month, or oftener, at the direction of the manager. 6. That as the cleaning, heating, lighting or any other matter common to both schools the expense shall be borne in the following proportion—two-thirds by Henry E. Carter and one-third by Mary Moore. 7. That all damage done to said premises shall be made good inside one week, and if not made good inside said time the manager may order such work to be executed and the amount furnished to the said principal teacher. 8. All damage referred to above in Clause 3 shall be made good by the principal teachers in whose department the said damage shall have occurred, and at his or her own expense. 9. All doors, passages, &c., used in common by both schools shall be kept in order, and the expense of repair borne by the said principal teachers in the proportion defined in Clause 7."

17557. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you the agreement that was actually signed?—No. I said the teachers would not raise any objection, although they were convinced of the unfairness of this document, provided this agreement was submitted to the National Board for consideration and for sanction, and that it was in accordance with the rules and regulations. It was laid before the Board, and a correspondence ensued, which occupied some four months or so, and the manager was unable to get from the National Board a clear Yes or No as to whether it was in accordance with the rules or not. I do not know who advised the manager to go to the Inspector, but he did. He went to the Inspector of the District at the time, and the Inspector told him that it was a matter for private arrangement. The Inspector told me afterwards that it was quite reasonable that the teacher should bear the expense. I do not know by whose authority the Inspector said so, but I took it that the authorities would not interfere in the matter, and that I would be removed in case I did not sign it or did not agree to the terms; so we have borne the expenses ever since up to 1911.

17558. Mr. HAMIL.—Everything included in that arrangement?—No, we have adopted other methods of raising the money for repairs.

17559. Mr. KUTLER.—You did sign an agreement?—No, we did not sign any agreement. It is a matter of private arrangement, privately, between the manager and myself, so that if I did not agree to this thing serious measures would be taken.

17560. The CHAIRMAN.—What is the name of the Inspector in 1898?—Mr. Pellow.

17561. Have you anything to add?—I do not want to weary you.

17562. Are you aware of any other agreements proposed at that time in Belfast, in your district?—No, I have never seen an agreement of that nature; but I think that private agreements are enforced in many cases, at least up to recently; but, of course, the new heating and cleaning grant has altered the complexion of affairs considerably; but previous to that I knew several people who were bearing the entire expense. For instance, in one school that I know who a teacher paid £35 a year.

17563. For expenses?—For expenses; as a sort of rent.

17564. Is that going on still?—I could not say whether it is going on.

17565. About what date did you know of its going on?—It was in operation two years ago.

17566. Mr. HARRISON.—That is a sort of composition?—A sort of composition.

17567. He pays, and the manager undertakes the job?—Yes.

17568. And he may make money out of it?—Yes.

17569. Do you mean that he pays down £25 a year towards the expenses?—Yes.

17570. And then the manager expends it?—Yes.

17571. The *Broom or Moss*?—Does that school belong to the congregation or to the National Board?—to whom does the school belong where the teacher has to pay a sum amounting to £25 a year?—It is in connection with the Church of Ireland.

17572. And it belongs to the Church?—It belongs to the Church.

17573. The teacher has no private pecuniary interest in the school, I suppose?—None whatever.

17574. And he has no interest in the ownership of the school?—Not so far as I am aware.

17575. Because we heard something about bogus schools?—Oh, no; this is a bona fide school, owned by the congregation.

17576. Mr. HARRISON.—Can you tell us what is the approximate sum that is annually raised by the managers of your school?—Of my own school?

17577. Yes. In other words, what is the amount of their annual average contribution to the upkeep and expenses of the school?—Nothing whatever. Any grants (I am speaking of the Methodist Church now) come from the central body of the Methodist Church.

17578. The managers themselves contribute nothing except what is allotted to them from the central fund—is that so?—That is so.

17579. And have no financial responsibility whatever?—None.

17580. Sir HERAM WILKINSON.—You were referring to the non-disclosure of the merit mark of the teacher that you mentioned, and you said that she applied to a Commissioner and ascertained that her merit mark was "V.G." for a certain number of years except one. Well, there is a way that suggests itself by which it might be found out what year that was?—That is being done.

17581. Another suggestion that is occurring to me is, that if on applying to any individual Commissioner a teacher can obtain his or her merit mark for a series of years, it does not seem that there is any good reason for abstaining from the declaration of such merit mark if applied for by the teacher direct?—But I understand that those merit marks have been refused even to Commissioners.

17582. But do you see any good reason for their refusal if they can be obtained through a Commissioner by asking?—I do not quite catch your point.

17583. Is there any reason whatever why the merit mark should be refused on a direct application if the Commissioners consider it right that it should be revealed on the application of an individual Commissioner?—I do not think that the Commissioners do think it is right to reveal these personal marks at all.

17584. And do you think that that Commissioner acted on his own responsibility in doing so?—He obtained it through some of the clerks in the office.

17585. Well, if it can be obtained in that way, you see no reason, of course, I suppose, why it should not be disclosed generally?—There is no reason; and I think a teacher is perfectly entitled to know any report which is sent in which refers to either his character or his ability as a teacher.

17586. Mr. HENRY.—You have had experience of working under inspectors of the Department and inspectors of the National Board. Now, will you tell the Committee, as briefly as you can, if you please, what is the difference in their mode of procedure—that is, the difference between the hearing and tone of the inspectors of the Department towards the teachers and that of the inspectors of the National Board, or is there any difference?—Oh, there is a very marked difference. When the inspector of the Technical Instruction Board comes in they will discuss the work which we are doing, and will often tell their experience of where they have been before, and the methods by which they taught certain subjects. They will look at the work on the board and say, "Is that

th way you do it? I have seen it done this way very successfully," and they make suggestions about the work, and one feels that it is done in a friendly way, and with the object of securing good work; whereas the inspectors of the National Board look on with an air of detachment at the work, and we do not know what ideas are passing through their minds; we only see or know what their feelings are by their observations in the Observation Book.

17587. One inspector is more sympathetic than the other?—Yes; the National Board Inspector stands aloof from the teachers, as if they were in a different atmosphere as it were.

17588. Mr. CORRY.—In the matter of appeals against the mark of the inspector do you not think that the teachers should, as a matter of right, have the power of appealing for a re-examination by a higher official?—I do.

17589. And do you think that if those appeals were granted as a matter of right, and the inspectors knew that his marking of the school was open to impartial revision by a higher official, it would rather tend to lessen the number of appeals than to multiply them?—I do.

17590. That the very fact of having that power of appealing would have that effect?—Yes.

17591. There was one part of your evidence that, in view of what we have had from other witnesses, I was rather surprised at—that children who are going to your technical school or children in your own school in the higher standards, with even that increased attention that has been given, I believe, to explanation, are not able to grasp intelligently the subject matter of what they have read in a paragraph. Is that your general experience?—Yes, I agree.

17592. And that there has really been no gain in the way of intelligent reading, in your experience, beyond what was acquired under the results' system, as far as reading is concerned?—As far as reading is concerned, but I think that the average child perhaps can read more fluently. But the children who passed on to the sixth and seventh standard under the old system were quite as good as they are under the present system.

17593. Mr. HENRY.—Are not the books easier now?—They are very much easier; far too easy. Personally I never use the easy readers.

17594. What do you use?—I have used the *Palmerston Readers* and I have used the *Royal Crown Readers*.

17595. None of these are as good as the Board's?—No, the old Board's Readers were admirable, especially the *Sixth Book*, and a child who passed through that book, and who knew it thoroughly had a good knowledge of English, and he knew the gems of literature better than the children do now.

17596. Mr. CORRY.—On most of the points that are covered by our terms of reference I really think that we have got sufficient evidence already, so I won't take you over this merit mark question or the labelling of teachers or anything else that I think the Committee has made up its mind that it has already got enough of evidence on, but I was rather struck by one statement that you made—that the present system is not conducive to sound education. You made that statement in your evidence?—Yes.

17597. Will you illustrate or develop that?—The idea which I had before my mind was that the examination system has been re-introduced again, and we are having the evils of the results' system practically re-introduced under the revised programme.

17598. Your difficulty as I apprehend it is, that while you have been teaching in the spirit of the revised programme the inspection made by certain inspectors is more on the mental storage than mental training?—Quite so.

17599. That is to say, that you are teaching in one spirit and the inspector is inspecting in another spirit?—Yes. Under the results' system the training of intelligence was not neglected. I have one report here of 1895 which says, "All the teachers exercise in the discharge of their duties great skill, and employ the most successful methods of imparting information and developing the thinking powers of the children."

Mr. THOMAS CHAMBERLAIN, Principal of Tyronnought National School, Grogan, County Down, examined.

17600. The CHAIRMAN.—You are principal of Tyronnought School?—Yes.

17601. That is quite near Downpatrick?—Yes.

17602. How long have you been principal?—Well, in fact, my whole teaching career has been spent in the parish. I taught in a school a mile and a half further down. This new school was built in 1900 and opened on the 1st of January, 1901.

17603. You have been there since 1901, in Tyronnought?—In that particular school, but in the same parish since 1880.

17604. Since 1880 you have been teaching in that same parish in another school?—Yes. And nine months before that in Belfast as assistant, I was in Coleraine Model School for two years previous.

17605. That is the history of your service under the Board?—Yes, I never was a member.

17606. What is the size of your National School at the present time as to numbers?—Well, our present average is for an assistant, but it will be over that, something about 80; it went up to close on 100 some years ago.

17607. You have an assistant at present?—I had two up to about five years ago.

17608. The numbers have fallen off?—The numbers have fallen off.

17609. What is your grade under the Board?—I am a second of first class teacher under the old system, and second of first grade under the new system.

17610. How long have you held that?—I have been B class since 1902, and B grade since 1904. On the 1st of April, 1904, I was promoted to the second of first grade.

17611. And have you had increments since that time in that grade?—Yes, I have got increments. My salary was fixed at £100. I got an increment and promotion at the same time in 1904, and I had an increment in 1907, that is all; none since.

17612. Have your merit marks declined in that time?—They have. My whole complaint is practically against one inspector.

17613. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—You wish to state your record under the results system. Would you please do that as shortly as you can?—My entire record since I first took charge of a school was good, that of the last four or five years of the results system could not be much better, and the year before the "results" were abolished I got the Carle and Blake Premium. That is counted among teachers as a very high mark; I think it is the highest the Commissioners give. That was under the old system.

17614. We will pass over the first sentence of your statement, and take it up again. I should like you to look now at No. 2, your record from 1901 to 1907?—Well, I have the reports here, and I have the minutes from the Observation Book. When I came up to the school I am at present engaged in, I got children from my old school, say, about 30, and the remainder consisted of children living at a distance from eight or nine schools in the districts that were second class. At the end of the first year Mr. Kelly, our present senior inspector, was the inspector, and he gave me "good." He told me in examining last year that I should have got "very good" at the time, but there was no "very good" recognised at that time, it came in after. There was "good" at that time, and "excellent." Well, Mr. Ross came after Mr. Kelly, and he gave me "very good."

17615. What years were those?—1903 I think Mr. Ross came. He gave me "very good" the next year "excellent," the next year "excellent," and the next year "excellent," three years in succession. Then Mr. McMillan came, and my whole grievance is practically against Mr. McMillan, and not against the system.

17616. The CHAIRMAN.—What year did he come?—1907, but the increment I got in 1907 did not depend on his report.

17617. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—The increment in 1907 was the result of your marks of "excellent" in the previous years?—Yes.

17618. The Bishop of Ross.—Was that a special increment?—No, the ordinary increment.

17619. Or was it at the end of the seven years period?—It was the ordinary period, at the end of the three years period. That brought me to the maximum of second of first.

17620. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—And since that time what have you had from Mr. McMillan?—"Good."

17621. All the time?—All the time. Mr. McMillan came after Mr. Ross and gave me "good," and Mr. Dewar came next year and confirmed that, and gave me of course "good," and Mr. McMillan followed up to last year, when we had the senior inspector, Mr. Kelly. He raised it to "very good."

17622. What had Mr. McMillan given you?—"Good" all the time.

17623. Up to last year when Mr. Kelly gave you "very good"?—Yes.

17624. Do you wish to put in anything to show that that merit mark was not properly assigned by Mr. McMillan?—I do—his conduct in the school was invariably very bad; it could not be worse, and it misnerved the children. I differ from him radically in his interpretation of the new system, and I have with me written work to show you how far apart we are in our ideas of it.

17625. You wish to contrast the methods of Messrs. Kelly and Ross with those of Mr. McMillan. Have you three minutes?—I have, sir.

17626. These begin with the year 1902. Is that where you wish to begin?—Yes, that was the first examination that was in the school; that is, when I had the children of the eight different schools with about thirty of my former pupils.

17627. And that is the year concerning which you have been informed by Mr. Kelly that your mark would have been "very good" if there had been a mark of "very good" at the time?—Yes.

17628. I propose to read these minutes. In that year Mr. Kelly says, "The progress was unmistakably good considering the ages of the pupils and the fact that they were promoted since the previous examination. The large number of pupils in sixth standard is an evidence of the popularity of the school. There were serious defects observed in explanation, arithmetic, including mental arithmetic and drawing in fifth standard."—The previous examination means an informal examination that he held in the school, and I promoted all the children after that, and tried to get them into a homogeneous mass.

17629. He says, "The large number of pupils in sixth standard is evidence of the popularity of the school." And in the next year you had Mr. Ross, and he gave you "very good," and this is his report:—"This is a very satisfactory school. The children are well behaved, and well trained, and display much interest in their work. The teaching appeals successfully to their intelligence. This has been especially observable in the arithmetic in the sixth standard. Progress books should be kept in the current year."—I ask you to pay special attention to arithmetic, because that was the standard attacked by Mr. McMillan, and Mr. Ross said it was "very good"—"this has been especially observable in the arithmetic in the sixth standard."

17630. And you say you were attacked by Mr. McMillan on that very subject?—Yes, on that very subject.

17631. In January, 1904, you have also a report from Mr. Ross, and he gave you "excellent," and the minute is:—"This thriving school has accomplished superior educational work in the past year. The instruction aims successfully at cultivating the intelligence of the children. This is particularly observable in arithmetic, in which the pupils show an exceptionally clear grasp of the principles of the subject." That is the 30th of January, 1904?—And under the old system Mr. Kelly told me practically the same thing.

17632. On the 8th of February, 1905, there is a report from Mr. Ross, and he gives you "excellent," and says:—"This is an admirably conducted and highly successful school. Both assistants, following the example of the principal, make preparation for their work, and the teaching is, consequently, sound and successful. The proficiency in composition and arithmetic is of a very high order of merit; increased accommodation is required."—I am also attacked on the composition, and the attack has gone on for years. I hold that I can convince you that I am right and the inspector entirely wrong in his estimate of my composition.

17633. You say that Mr. Ross gave you "excellent" in 1905 on the proficiency of composition, and that your pupils have never fallen away?—Mr. Ross told me after the examination was over that it was a liberal education for a boy that went through the course of Essays I gave my senior pupils, and which was far beyond anything required by the programme.

18th July, 1913.]

Mr. THOMAS CARRIL, examined.

[Continued.]

Mr. Ross examined the Essays most minutely, and said I was doing splendid work on the right lines. Mr. McMillan, at his first annual examination, never opened a book of them though we had a powerful.

17634. In 1906 Mr. Ross inspected you, and gave you the merit mark "excellent," and he says:—"The teachers continue to bestow much intelligence and thought upon their methods of work. The instruction, which is sound and successful, gives evidence of systematic preparation. The general progress of the school is 'excellent.' The class-room should be enlarged and heated. A small globe should be procured." Now, on the 12th September, 1907, comes Mr. McMillan, and he gives you "good," reducing your mark from "excellent" to "good," and then he says:—"Proficiency in reading and writing, and except in first standard spelling, composition, except oral and needlework was 'good' or sometimes 'very good,' but in arithmetic, grammar, and geography the instruction was far from efficient. Kindergarten was not taught nor drill duly performed. The written work of Mr. Casement's standard is not properly corrected. There is no evidence of due preparation for work, nor is a progress record kept. The timetable is defective, the registers are in arrears, and the roll book is not kept according to the instruction. The schoolroom walls are not kept clean or white-washed. The boys' offices should be cleaner. Miss O'Flynn arrived late on the day of inspection. Another easel is required."—There was nothing else that could be wrong; that included everything. I wish to offer a word or two of explanation. I deny altogether that the boys' offices were anything only perfect. It is one of the best offices in the county, and the manager would spend any money before he would have it anything else.

17635. Was it clean?—It was perfectly clean.

17636. You deny that these observations against you are correct?—I do, sir; in fact, I am prepared to swear it.

17637. And there had been no falling away in the teaching of composition and arithmetic?—None. I would say there had been an improvement, especially in composition.

17638. In 1908 Mr. Dewar gave you "good." In what relation did Mr. Dewar stand as Inspector to Mr. McMillan?—Well, he was the senior inspector.

17639. You say that the reduction that appears in these reports which we are in the course of reading represents fairly what was done by Mr. McMillan in the other schools of the district?—Quite so; only as a matter of fact, that he did worse in some of those schools than he did in mine, and brought them from "excellent" to "fair."

17640. Mr. HARRISON.—Did Mr. Dewar succeed Mr. Ross?—He did, as senior.

17641. Sir HERAM WICKHAM.—Mr. Dewar says—"The teachers are assiduous and painstaking, and have given their pupils a satisfactory training in neatness, order and industry. More care should be devoted to drawing, in which the lines are rather coarse, and to arithmetic, in which practical questions should receive more attention. The instruction given in English and singing is very suitable, but reading was not taught to the infants in accordance with the Notes for Teachers, and rather much unnecessary help was given to the pupils of the senior division at arithmetic lessons. There is no globe and no large map of Europe, the British Islands or Ireland in the school. Some entries for the year 30/8/07 are not yet posted into the registers." You have no special observation to make on that?—No, sir. Mr. Dewar was a gentleman that gave the children every opportunity of answering, but I could not say the same of the other men. He was in no way offensive; he was nice with the teachers, and with all concerned.

17642. Mr. McMillan came in 1909 and gave you the mark "good," and he says:—"The school is efficiently conducted, and the pupils receive in various respects a good training. They speak out clearly and distinctly, they write on the whole well, and their conduct is excellent. In arithmetic, explanation, and grammar the seniors' answering was not good. The proper course in history was not done, and in penmanship and in checking and correction of the written work there is room for improvement. Drill should be

regularly taught. Only 35 pupils were promoted last June out of 76 on the roll in the second to fifth standards, inclusive. A map of the British Isles and a globe are required. Composition and drill are not properly provided for?"

17643. Mr. HARRISON.—Does that mean that out of 76 children 35 were kept again to the work of the same year?—Well, I will tell you. The great majority of the children, if they were promoted that year, would be in the fourth class, and I would have practically no third, so I simply divided the class in two and held back half to put with a very small second class coming into the third. I promoted practically every child 50 per cent. the previous year.

17644. Does that mean that those 35 children would a second year take the same course?—Yes, the same course.

17645. Mr. HENLY.—In reading?—No; the readers have to be changed, of course.

17646. Sir HERAM WICKHAM.—Is there any other observation to make?—Well, the globe has cropped up again.

17647. Did you not get a globe?—We sent for one years before that, and we could not get the globe from the office, though they were paid for it seven years previously. They sent a picture of a rat at the same price, half-a-crown; this picture is hanging behind the school door from that time to this. The manager got a globe in Belfast when we could not get one from the office, and we would have got one at first, but I asked him not until we try to get our own.

17648. Did you inform Mr. McMillan of that?—I informed Mr. Ross and Mr. Dewar, and they both enjoyed it, but I did not inform Mr. McMillan, for he would not allow me to say anything to him. He asks questions of teachers in presence of pupils, and it is very humiliating to have to answer them. I was afraid of my bumper in those cases, and found this strain very irritating. Mr. Kelly and Mr. Ross would never do things that way. I had seriously considered absconding myself from school, and reporting that I was not fit for the strain of the examination. Dr. Starke and the Commissioners could then take whatever course they liked.

17649. In September, 1910, Mr. McMillan again examined the schools, and he says:—"Illness and absence of the principal teacher have very much affected the proficiency, which may be regarded in the circumstances as generally good, though there was considerable weakness shown in the junior division. Discipline and order were very good. A great improvement has been effected by shifting the partition so that the two rooms are now nearly equal in point of size. Arrangements for history and drill are not satisfactory." What is the meaning of "arrangements" there?—Noting on the time-table. He requires very definite noting on the time-table, and what would satisfy any other inspector would not satisfy him.

17650. In July, 1911, Mr. McMillan gave you "good," and he says:—"The school continues to be well conducted. The first and second standards should be grouped at reading. I found the general proficiency good, and discipline well maintained. Additional desk accommodation is required." Have you any remarks to make on that?—None, sir, further than this: that if he gave me "very good," which according to some of these reports you would expect on reading them, I would get an increment. It was the want of "very good" that kept me from the increment and promotion all along.

17651. And that is the last of his reports?—And then I have another belonging to Mr. Kelly.

17652. Mr. Kelly, on the 24th of October, 1912, gives you "very good," and he says:—"The intelligence and deportment of the pupils make a very favourable impression. Reading is very good. Particular attention is given to explanation, and composition, oral and written, deserves special commendation. The remaining subjects are taught with generally satisfactory results, the rendition of the singing being very expressive. The pupils are trained to habits of attention and self-reliance, and they are imbued with the spirit of work. The rooms are well ventilated and lighted, and they are kept with taste." That is your last report, and what I understood you

to argue is that, that before Mr. McMillan came you got "excellent," and after Mr. McMillan examined you got "good," and with the exception of Mr. Dewar's examination, in which you also got "good," you consider that the marks by Mr. McMillan do not fairly represent the merit of your school?—Yes, quite so; I know they do not; the thing would be impossible, and that is typical of every school that Mr. Ross paraded either "very good" or "excellent" in the district, without exception; and I have been asked to ask you to demand from the Education Office the mark marks of the schools that are at present under Mr. McMillan—for the first 3 years after his coming, and for the 3 years immediately before he came, so that you could see for yourselves the havoc wrought in the district.

17052. Now in No. 4 you refer to Mr. McMillan's first visit. State what occurred?—I was teaching two monitors I had in the gallery, and the male assistant was teaching five or six pupils English. That was at 9.15 or 9.16 in the morning. The latch lifted, and a bicycle wheel hit the back door (our front door is rarely open). The door only opens half-way, because it is so fixed, so he got entangled in the bicycle coming in. That was the first I ever saw of him, and he came in in a towering rage; he pulled the latch of the door and said, "What sort of a fixture is this?" I tried to explain. When I was explaining he walked up and down the room a while, and told me to get him the books; that he was the inspector (which I may tell you I knew by this). So I got him the books, and things went on till the beginning of the ordinary school work, when the assistant was asked by the inspector to read dictation. The inspector went on with the ordinary "results" system examination. The assistant began reading dictation, but before he had read two lines he shouted out from one end of the school to stop that, that he was giving the children a clue. Now I could never know or make out then or since how he could give them a clue, because there were no such words, say, as "effect" or "affect." He was reading very slowly, so that the children would be able to write it. I was called on to read the dictation, and I read faster, but there was no other change; the assistant was a very good reader. That was the opening of our first examination with him. After the pupils came in from play they went to singing. The female assistant was one of the best teachers of singing in the country, and she got the children in a line round the school, but they had not all song books—only one out of every five had a book—he shouted out to her why they had not all books. Were they 25 a piece, or 15, a piece, or 20, a piece? He then shouted to her had she any substitution at all for teaching singing. She was greatly upset before the pupils, and it made her most miserable. The pupils sing well.

17053. Mr. COOPER.—Did he say that in the presence of the pupils?—Everything was in the presence of the pupils, and you could hear him away out on the main road.

17054. Is he still in the service?—Yes, and still my inspector, and intimate with me. In fact we are friends. I am one of the few teachers that are friendly with him. There are teachers that would not speak to him when he came into their school, and I did that myself for a good while, but I thought it was not he, but the body that he was representing, that was to blame. When I broke down in health, and was in hospital he was very nice to me, and volunteered to procure a substitute for me; but I would not do my duty if I did not tell the other side too, for the other is the truth.

17055. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Go on with the other. You have spoken of his rudeness to the pupils and female assistant?—He is a man of a very stern nature and very strong features; more than the ordinary height, fairly developed, and he seems to have a dislike to children. Candidly, I could not express it less. My infants and juniors have a habit of snapping their fingers in eagerness to answer. I never prevent them. This got on his nerves completely, and it was sad and horrible to see himself and a class of infants quite upset over what Mr. Kelly and Mr. Ross would be glad to see. The fault was duly recorded against me in the Observation Book, where it stands as one of

the many monuments to my inefficiency. He went round the third class that were working at arithmetic, and I was working at something at the other end of the school. I did not know he examined the class at all in arithmetic, when he shouted down to me. "Did you teach these any arithmetic?" At that time he had examined them, and pronounced them gully. This was publicly, in the presence of everybody. His whole comments are made before all the pupils, and make teaching doubly hard by leaving a want of confidence in the minds of the children. He asked me did I teach them any arithmetic; I said I did, and they were splendid (not knowing he had examined them). Then he gave them a question, and asked them what sort of heads they had on them at all, was it turkeys they had? We would not complete that, because many a time teachers say things that they should not say; but that is only a mild part of it. I have also to mention his rudeness to the female assistant. She is now after coming out of hospital, being practically on the sick list, and she told me often that it was a serious drawback to her the thought of his next visit to the school, in her present state of health; and that from the day that he first came to the school she never felt the same health. I have seen her after a day's visit in practically a collapsed state. She went home to her lodgings and took a car to a surgeon in Downpatrick. His first question to her was, did she get any severe shock lately; and I may tell you she did though she denied it to him. She was not able to leave the school for a good while after the pupils were dismissed. She is prepared to come before you and explain the case herself if you wish. There is nothing harrowing that could be done that he does not do. Now, as to myself, he came in the day that the second assistant left. He had been in Crossgar School. The parish priest is manager of both schools, and Father ———— had told him three that my assistant had left that day. He then drove out to my school, and met the assistant, and knew him well, and that he was just leaving. He came into my class in the school, and asked what classes were there. I said fifth, sixth, and seventh; he then asked me what brought me the fifth, that was not according to the time-table. I told him, and he questioned me up and down how and why we lost the second assistant, though the manager told him an hour previously. I consider his questioning me before the pupils about what he already knew from the manager as most unbecoming, and looked like an attempt to test the accuracy of one of us against the other. After questioning me about the assistant, he asked me to show my written preparation for the day's work; all this was in the presence of the children. A teacher should not be challenged thus before his pupils, and Mr. McMillan's unbecoming rule in my school was to ask what would be very irritating and very humiliating to answer. These could be asked privately.

17056. Mr. COOPER.—You don't like to let the children hear everything?—That is what I mean. He asked me for my written work, and I told him that I had none, but that I had it marked down, and I showed him the place in the books, what I did the day before, and what I was doing at the lesson at that time. It was an explanation out of Pinkey's Reader of a piece from Milton's "Paradise Lost." After looking at what was three days' work (I am a great believer in doing a thing thoroughly if you do it at all), he told me I could do that in half an hour. I said I could do it in five minutes, by not doing it, and I asked him did the Board recommend smothering of that kind; he pushed the book at me, and told me, before the whole pupils, I had smothering in the head.

17057. Did he say that loud enough for the pupils to hear it?—Everything he said, from the first word to the last, was in the loudest possible voice in the presence of everybody. With the female assistant he did the same thing. She had her book opened at the beginning of the year, and marked all the parts that should cover the whole year's programme within the time, to go over the book twice. He told her that her week's work could be done in a day. Now she spent a good deal of time at the beginning of July preparing for the year's work, and divided the book into sections from the first page to the last, and she used her own best judgment, and in the presence of every child that is what she got, at the very first

visit afterwards, "that it could be done in a day," when she had taken a week, though she could have covered that book twice in twelve months at the rate she was going.

17653. She had intended to have repetitions?—The second six months. She usually went over the programme twice. And she had the book spaced from end to end, and very carefully done.

17654. That finishes his second visit, and you have other visits as well?—Yes.

17655. And does that fairly represent his manner in your school from first to last?—He is very mild now. He has got as mild as you like; dangerously so, those last six weeks or so; before that he was getting a bit mild too, but in the beginning he was simply awful.

17656. The Bishop of Ross?—Had you a visit from him within the last six weeks?—Well, I had. I had two. He examined a few boys in mathematics, but of course, I did not come much in contact with him, but he was really nice, almost like another inspector.

17657. Sir HINAM WILKINSON.—Since how long ago has his manner changed in your school?—I could not give the date, but I would say three months.

17658. Mr. HENRY.—Was it since we sat?—Well, I would attribute it to that candidly, so that you are doing some good in some places.

17659. Sir HINAM WILKINSON.—And you say that the teachers of the district are of the same opinion with yourself, and have had the same experience?—Worse. I know one teacher at the other end of the parish. Killylea is one end of the parish, and I am at Fynonaght, the other end. Just beside me in Cossage there is another school worse treated than mine. In Killylea the Catholic teacher and the Protestant teacher, both men with excellent marks in Mr. Ross's time, came down to "fair," and one of them got admonished a couple of times from the office for saying "Boob" or "Nonsense" to Mr. McMillan when he was initiated beyond enduring. The soul teacher, who had doubled his average attendance since his school opened, was brought from "excellent" to "fair." He changed the calling of the roll in the whole district, and would not allow a monitor call it, as was always done. He prevented any monitor from calling the roll, and got a caution sent from the office that I was not to allow my monitor call it. He insisted on making the Killylea teacher call his roll twice, and would on no account allow him enter the marks from the Irish roll into the other, though the pupils were already marked "present." This led to a great waste of teachers' time and energy, and got him admonished.

17660. Sir HINAM WILKINSON.—And it arose out of that?—Yes. And we teach the monitor how to keep the roll book by getting him to mark the roll.

17661. Now there is a point that you refer to here, and that is absence of appeals against inspectors?—I have an appeal case altogether different from that.

17662. But you are speaking of the reason why teachers do not appeal against Mr. McMillan?—Yes.

17663. What is the reason?—We were afraid of appealing. I would have appealed 25 years ago when I was prevented (because I taught in a left) from going in for first of first when I was able to get it, after being trained. The inspector would not allow me because the house was bad, and I would have appealed only from fear. We only give ourselves away when we appeal. The inspector hears what is our opinion of him, and our opinion of Mr. McMillan is not very good; and that is the reason I and many others did not appeal. He could keep that up his sleeve (for it is human nature to do it), and in the years to come we might feel it. I have no faith whatever in appeal at present, neither have the other teachers.

17664. You refer here to a particular instance in which you did not appeal from fear of consequences?—Fear of consequences.

17665. And did you not appeal for re-examination in Irish?—Yes, and paid dear for it then and since.

17666. Will you tell us about that very shortly?—First and foremost, Mr. McMillan does not know Irish to examine orally, as we are directed to teach it.

17667. Do you know Irish?—I do, sir, fairly well.

17668. And do you teach Irish?—I did, and do, and was very successful at it; in fact, my children came up to Dublin from that non-Irish-speaking place and

best children from all Ireland. I had two good fourth class boys not a bit better than the general, and brought them up. I promoted one from the fourth class into the fifth, and put him as a fifth class boy, as I was entitled. He got first in all Ireland and the other got second in the fourth class, besides numbers of other prizes locally at Irish-speaking competitions.

17669. Now, about the question of appeal for re-examination?—He came to the school and examined without using one sentence in Irish (that was Mr. McMillan), and we are told by the programme to teach by the "direct method"—that is, to teach by speaking the language.

17670. And have you taught them the Irish language?—Yes; and they were complimented by good examiners and inspectors of Irish—viz., Mr. Kelly and Mr. Mangin; and he came and examined, and he knew no spoken Irish practically himself. He did not use one sentence, and they were used to being examined in Irish, through Irish, and kept thinking in the Irish as recommended. I felt for him, and began asking questions in Irish when I saw he could get nothing out of them, by questions about Irish in English. I never attempted to interfere with Mr. McMillan only that one time, and he could not object, because he could not ask one question himself, but I did not ask many. If I did he might tell me not to interfere with his examination; but I asked some without permission from him, and he left it in his report that he came to test and examine as to the "instruction in Irish." Rather than let him go without getting anything out of the pupils, I put them some questions, which I had no right to do, and he did not say "quit it" or "begin it." The very day I got the fees for that, as the trustee would have it so, he came in about five minutes after, on his visit to the school. I saw that I was getting out to half face, and asked him why he did it. He simply said teachers would never be pleased, and that I could appeal if I thought I'd make anything by it. I said I certainly would. I may say that on leaving the school on the day of the Irish examination he told me I would likely get "out" in the fees for not keeping an Irish roll throughout the whole year. He told Mr. McGuire, of Ardglass, the same some days previously, and Mr. McGuire reminded him that the Board's notice came out in the middle of the year. It looks as if he was preparing me for half face, but wished to blame the roll for it.

17671. Mr. HENRY.—The order of the Board to keep a special roll for extra subjects was only introduced in the middle of the year?—Yes, and I kept it from that day, and the thing then left my mind.

17672. Sir HINAM WILKINSON.—And did you appeal against that decision about half fees?—Yes, I appealed. Father did not want me to appeal because there was a row on in the other end of the parish with Mr. McMillan and his other teacher. I said I would appeal to the Committee of the Gaelic League, and get them to send down someone to examine. The manager is very nice with Mr. McMillan, and wanted no row. He was present at the Irish examination, but to a man entirely opposed to finding fault with inspectors. His motto is patience. He is on retreat, and I have not spoken to him about my evidence, so there are details I cannot mention. I appealed anyhow, and in a fortnight, in the ordinary course, we got word from the Office that it was no use. Now there was not a question examined in Irish, and we were told, as of course every teacher knows, to teach Irish through the Irish language, and we carried it out faithfully. The Board's officer did not ask one question in Irish, and I believe he could not. Anyhow he did not.

17673. And what was the result of the appeal?—It was refused to the manager, though I said when applying that the inspector did not use one question in Irish.

17674. Mr. HENRY.—That the appeal was refused?—The appeal was refused. I wrote to the Gaelic League here in Dublin, and gave them the whole case. I gave them an account of this appeal, and asked them to put the case before Dr. Starke, and let him know how the examination was conducted, and remind him of the rule requiring the language to be taught and examined on orally. The case was brought before Dr. Starke, and what was refused to the manager was granted to the Gaelic League; or at least some conse-

18th July, 1913.]

Mr. THOMAS CHAMBERLAIN, examined.

[Continued.]

sign. He did not grant the re-examination anyhow, but promised to have a capable examiner sent next year, and if my pupils were good I would get the previous lost money back. I would never run the risk of appealing if I did not feel sure of my pupils being fit; and I was quite satisfied with Dr. Sturkie's arrangement, though it was not what I had a good right to, nor was it what I asked. I was not so much concerned about the money as about the failing of pupils that were previously pronounced excellent by competent examiners; and this failure to be brought about by a man who spoke no Irish one way or another. Next year Mr. Mangin, a native speaker, and one of the Irish Inspectors came down, and out me to half fees also.

17660. On what ground?—Well, I will read you his report. He had examined my pupils before. This is Mr. Mangin's minute.

17661. This is his minute in the Observation Book, dated the 16th of June, 1909?—Yes.

17662. In what year was the first examination?—The first examination was in the previous year to that.

17663. That would be 1908; then, on the 16th of June, 1909, Mr. Mangin writes:—"Tested Irish class. The sub-heads of the programme ought to receive regular attention. Poetry, grammar and spelling were weak. There should be more attention given to written composition in Standards 5 and 6. D. Mangin." That was in 1909?—There are previous reports of Irish examinations.

17664. By whom?—Mr. Kelly and Mr. Mangin; and Mr. Kelly in his report on the Irish examination in 1906 says:—"I was much surprised. They exhibited an excellent knowledge of the language for a non-Irish-speaking locality."

17665. Mr. COFFEY.—You appealed, and Mr. Mangin was sent to examine your school the next year?—Yes.

17666. And everybody knows Mr. Mangin is a capable examiner?—Well, there is no question of that.

17667. And you think that under the circumstances it was as much as could be done to send down Mr. Mangin?—Well, I asked for, and had a perfect right to, a re-examination there and then, in justice. Mr. Mangin put me to half fees. The report is there, on the subheads that few ever teach. You could fail any school from Cook to Antrim if you go into the spelling programme of the Board, and Dr. Hyde could not prepare a class of pupils on it.

17668. You are up against this position, that everybody, I think, recognises Mr. Mangin as both a capable and fair official. I think it is generally recognised that he is capable and fair?—Well, I would not say fair in this case. He simply backed up the other inspectors.

17669. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—The reason why you consider why he is not fair is that he examined in details that were not taught?—Well, I had known him before, and I knew by his manner when he came into the school.

17670. The CHAIRMAN.—That is not evidence. You are asking us to accept your own impression?—Well, from his words, from what he said to me. This is what he said to me when he came into the school, and we had been very friendly previously. He asked me some questions, and I told him I had not got them. He told me that if I wanted to be an ass he did not want to be one. I thought this was rather abrupt in the morning, at the very first salute, and I found him sharp with the children. When he was leaving in the evening he said, "I am going to spend the evening with your friend, Mr. McMillan." And he did so.

17671. Have you been examined in Irish since?—I have six; I was previously examined, but I did not bother going in for a certificate. I have a certificate from the Board.

17672. But was your school examined in Irish since that?—It was, and I got paid for it. It was examined by the ordinary Irish inspectors, not by Mr. Mangin.

17673. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—You got no fees from the National Board?—I did, my lord; I got fees the same as usual.

17674. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Full fees?—Full fees, so far as I recollect.

17675. You have received the full fees on all occasions?—On all occasions. I broke down, and you cannot claim fees when you have not taught the full year, so my pupils were not examined.

17676. And, except the year in which your health failed you, you had your school examined in Irish, and you obtained full fees on each of those occasions?—Yes.

17677. And you had obtained full fees in every year year before that year in which Mr. McMillan examined you?—Yes; and I was told by Mr. Mangin that it was the best school in the North of Ireland for Irish the years before Mr. McMillan examined it.

17678. Now, to proceed?—You wanted to say something about the merits of the results system as against the new system. Well, we have heard a great deal of evidence with regard to that. I will just ask you this. You would not like the results system, again?—No, sir, I would not; but I am greatly afraid that the present staff of inspectors are not able to appreciate the spirit of the new—that they are worse often than the teachers, but it is so as the burden falls.

17679. That they have not put themselves in accord with it?—That they have not put themselves in accord with it.

17680. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—And do you approve of the new system yourself?—I thought it was an angel's voice the evening I read Dr. Sturkie's address, where he so happily referred to the "mosaic of half-crowns and shillings on the old results sheet." I remember another teacher and myself talking of it, and our feeling was that there was a change of now doing work for the children that there never had been before.

17681. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—And you think that the inspectors have not grasped the full spirit of the new system, and still work upon the old system?—Yes; some of them seem to work on the new lines. I should say that Mr. Ross has the new system.

17682. You say reading is not taught as it should be?—That it is not taught at all in proportion to its importance. I mean "thoughtful" reading, not declamation.

17683. How would you teach it?—Well, for less, and for more. I would insist on ten times more explanation of the subject than inspectors look for, but only say 20 or 30 lessons to be so closely examined on, and by the teacher. He can draw out his pupils better. Our reading is far too thorough, and we have no time to spend in thorough teaching of explanation.

17684. Now as to essay writing and its correction?—Well, gentlemen, you should read this essay. The first time that Mr. Dewar came I complained that Mr. McMillan never examined my essays that were, I thought, very good. When next Mr. McMillan came he asked for the written work. I gave him the essay books. He read one, and asked, "Where did this boy copy this from?" I said he did not copy it. He merely replied, "This fellow can write." In the Observation Book he said, "The teacher allows the children's essays to run to too great a length. This I emphatically deny. Mr. Ross, after carefully reading them, said I was doing splendid work by their means, as I believe I am, and have been. I have brought an essay book, and I would appeal to you, as gentleman with a knowledge of literature, if he is not wrong in every one of ten corrections he made in that Fifth Class child's essay."

17685. What does he say?—At the end of his examination he wrote "nonsense" across the face of it. He said a calf could not say the day it was calved, and he wrote "nonsense" across it.

17686. Then you also think that improvement could be made in the teaching of geography?—Yes. Less prodding with a pointer at words and spots. The old geographical programme was well planned, but became mechanical—ourselves and the inspectors made it so.

17687. And your point is that you consider that you had been most successful with other inspectors in the mode of your teaching, and that you found Mr. McMillan to take exception to that same mode of teaching?—Quite so. But I am no worse than every other one in my neighbourhood.

Mr. JOSEPH SMITH, B.A., B.Sc., Principal of Nicholson Memorial School, Lisburn, examined.

17708. The CHAIRMAN.—You are a Bachelor of Arts of the Royal University and Bachelor of Science of London University, and also first of first class and best of first grade and Principal Teacher of Nicholson Memorial School, Lisburn?—Yes.

17709. And how long have you been head master of that school?—Three years.

17710. You succeeded Mr. McCluggage?—Mr. McCluggage.

17711. Who are the managers of that school?—The present manager is Rev. R. H. S. Cooper.

17712. And where were you before that?—For the two years preceding that I was lecturer in mathematics at the Belfast Technical School, and for twelve years preceding that I was principal teacher of the Stevenson School, Dummurry.

17713. Had you any school before?—Yes, I was four years teaching in a school in the County Cavan.

17714. You were assistant there?—No, I was principal.

17715. And anything before that?—I was pupil teacher for two years in Bailieboro' Model School.

17716. And, I suppose, that carries you up to the beginning, does it?—Yes.

17717. You were engaged in teaching at the time you took your degree?—Yes.

17718. When did you take your degree of B.Sc.?—In 1904.

17719. And that was after private study?—Partly private study, and I attended the lectures in experimental physics at the Queen's University, Belfast.

17720. Now, had you any part in the movement in Belfast in the year 1911, when the deputation went up to have an interview with Dr. Sturges?—No. For two years I had been out of the service of the National Board, and my school report had not been reduced up to that time. From September, 1908, to August, 1910, I was lecturer in mathematics in the Municipal Technical Institute in Belfast.

17721. And up to that time your reports had not been reduced?—My reports had been "very good."

17722. So that as regards the inspector's marks you had nothing personally to complain of?—No, not up to that time.

17723. Have you had anything to complain of since?—Yes, I was appointed to my present school the Nicholson Memorial School, Lisburn, in August, 1910. This school had previously been reduced from "excellent" to "good."

17724. That was under Mr. McCluggage?—Yes. Mr. Keith inspected the school on the 9th of June, 1911, and he reports:—"This school has made creditable progress during the year. The teachers are skilful, and make satisfactory preparation. Science and cookery were introduced, and have been taught with success. Discipline and tidiness are meritorious. Some weakness is noticeable in fifth standard arithmetic and fourth standard geography, but on the whole the efficiency is nearly 'very good.'"

17725. Was that a report in your own time?—Yes, at the end of the first year, and he assigned the mark "good," and he wrote to the manager saying he was pleased with the work done, and stated that if the same rate of progress was maintained he would raise the report to "very good" the following year. Mr. P. J. Honan, who had been transferred to this school, inspected on the 27th of May, 1913. He assigned the mark "good." As I was not satisfied that his method of inspecting and examining did justice to the work of myself and the other teachers during the year I applied for a re-inspection. I have here the letter that I sent in if you wish to have it in evidence.

17726. I think we had better have it?—This letter I sent to the manager and asked him to send it on to the Education Office under a covering letter:—"Rev. Sir,—With reference to the mark 'good' awarded by Mr. P. J. Honan in his report of the inspection conducted by him on 27th May, I desire to say on behalf of the other teachers and myself that we are not satisfied that this mark does justice to our work during the past year, and I respectfully request you to apply for a re-inspection of the school. Mr. Honan reports that arithmetic in standards below fifth is only 'fair.' The examination in standards 5 and 6 consisted of problems dictated by Mr. Honan,

and as his accent was strange to the pupils, many of them did not get the questions correctly taken down. In standard 4 only one problem was given to each child, and I consider it rather unfair to condemn the work of a class on a test so meagre. In standard 3 the difficulty of understanding Mr. Honan's accent was especially felt; and from my knowledge of the proficiency of these classes I am convinced that if the same questions had been written on the blackboard or dictated by the teachers of the classes a much better result would have been obtained. In standards 1 and 2 the tests were entirely oral, and the teacher in charge of these classes maintains that the answering was satisfactory, except in the case of a few pupils, and these weak ones received special attention from Mr. Honan. No adverse report has been made on the teaching of arithmetic in these standards under the same teachers during the past two years. Mr. Honan also reports unfavourably on the reading. The following are extracts from Mr. Keith's observations made on the 15th of November, 1910:—"The pupils in standard 2 read distinctly and audibly. Reading in standards 5 and 6 is clear and distinct." I am of opinion that the reading has been very much improved since Mr. Keith made these encouraging observations. Mr. Honan writes in the Observation Book that the writing is good, but the children hold their pens badly. These two statements seem irreconcilable. Mr. Keith inspected the school on the 9th June, 1911, and he concludes his report with these words:—"On the whole, the efficiency is now nearly 'very good.' Further, in his letter to the Rev. R. U. Greer, who was then the manager, he stated that if the same rate of progress was maintained during the succeeding year he would raise the report to 'very good.' As an increment of salary is due to me this year, I have done everything possible not only to maintain but to increase the rate of progress. I might mention that during my last five years' service (1904-'08) in Stevenson School, Dummurry, that school was awarded 'very good,' the inspectors during this period including Mr. Kelly and Mr. Wulphy. I invite the most searching examination in every subject on the programme, and the fullest inspection of the methods of work, and am confident that the school deserves a much higher mark than that awarded by Mr. Honan."

17727. Did he forward that to the Board?—He forwarded that with a covering letter asking for re-inspection.

17728. What was the result?—My letter was sent on the 11th of June, three weeks before the end of the school year, and the manager simply got a formal acknowledgment, and no intimation that the school would be re-inspected, but on the 29th of August Mr. Chambers, senior inspector, came into the school.

17729. Had he been sent with the definite purpose of re-inspecting it?—Yes, sir, so it seemed afterwards; but I did not know that at the time and the manager did not know.

17730. Do you mean that Mr. Chambers did not inform you when he came in that he had been ordered to re-inspect the school?—No; the manager came in also (I sent word to the manager that he was in), and he did not tell the manager that he was sent to re-inspect the school. Mr. McNeill, in his evidence before this Committee, in answer to question 1604, gave an outline of the method of procedure in such cases. He said that "he (senior inspector) will ascertain from the teacher all that he has got to say; he is bound to get the teacher's views." I had examined the school very carefully in the month of June, and preserved the written answers of the pupils. From these Mr. Chambers could easily have formed an opinion on the work done, but when I proposed showing these to him he replied that he did not want to see them. He did examine the progress record for the past year. Mr. Chambers on entering the school asked for my preparation for the work of the day, and although I had made much more careful preparation than is required according to the circular to inspectors of March, 1910, yet he reported that I should make more careful preparation for my work.

17731. Mr. Convey.—You say you made adequate preparation and Mr. Chambers thought you had not, and we are not judges?—I submitted to Mr. Chambers a complete scheme of history lessons for the year with copious notes; a composition scheme, which includes

a large portion of the grammar work for the year, with notes; a scheme of drawing containing freehand copies, geometrical problems, and a list of objects for object drawing. I have also, in addition to the organiser's notes, very complete notes on the elementary science course; a scheme of physical drill exercises; and a large number of notes of geography lessons, but as these were not required on the day of his visit Mr. Chambers did not see them. So far from expressing any appreciation of this preparation, Mr. Chambers remarked that these were not what the Commissioners required. In addition to the preparation to which I referred I make out each afternoon an outline of the proposed work for the following day, specifying the examples to be worked in arithmetic, the subjects for composition, errors to be corrected, sentences for analysis, &c., with reference to detailed notes where necessary. On the date of his visit Mr. Chambers saw my outline of the day's work, but objected that I had not teaching notes for multiplication of money by 200, 400, &c., nor for finding the weight of one cubic centimetre of water.

17732. Mr. HARRISON.—Was that for your own lessons to be given in these subjects?—Yes.

17733. Has he any authority for asking for notes—are they prescribed and required?—I will just read you the official regulations:—"Brief Notes of Lessons which would be inadequate in the case of a young teacher of a few months' standing may be superfluous and unnecessary for efficient teachers of skill and experience. Preparation for school work falls naturally under three divisions, viz., plan of work, treatment of lessons, provision of apparatus and materials, but in the majority of lessons in the ordinary school subjects an efficient teacher of 10 or 15 years' standing should be able to give adequate instruction without special preparation beyond a few minutes' revision of the subject."

17734. The CHAIRMAN.—Your point is that you had gone beyond the Board's demand?—Yes, sir, much beyond it.

17735. And did Mr. Chambers point out to you in what respect you had fallen short of it?—No; he said the Commissioners required daily preparation of Notes of Lessons in every subject the teacher had to teach, and he not only did that, but he took a copy of the Commissioners' rules, and marked this point in the Commissioners' rules, page 94.

17736. What year?—1932-33.

17737. Read the passage?—"The teachers are expected to be familiar with the 'Notes for Teachers,' and teachers are required to show evidence of daily preparation for the work of the school. Very elaborate notes are not necessary for this purpose." Mr. Chambers underlined those words, "show evidence of daily preparation," and put his initials and the date.

17738. I suppose he emphasised "daily"?—Yes.

17739. And that was because you had not been doing it from day to day?—Yes, and I showed him my notebook.

17740. The point is that you had not done it from day to day, but you had done it several days ahead?—I had all the history scheme of notes written out in the holidays, and the same in my composition and grammar lessons.

17741. And did you not understand that he expected you to do that the night before the lessons?—Yes, and he re-wrote those notes every day.

17742. We need not carry that any further. Do you wish to say any more on that?—Not if the Committee are satisfied with the information I have given on the subject.

17743. Mr. HARRISON.—I should like to clear up one point, that is, whether the inspector's remarks applied to your lessons in arithmetic? Did you understand that he expected from you definite preparation each day in the arithmetic lessons?—Yes.

17744. And did you call his attention to that paragraph of the instructions which you have just read to us, saying that that was not expected from a teacher of long experience?—The teachers never had those instructions until this book of yours was issued.

17745. But, of course, he had it then?—Yes, he must have had it.

17746. But you are clearly of opinion that the remarks applied to the preparation for elementary subjects?—Absolutely sure.

17747. And not merely to such subjects as history and geography, which you allow do require a certain amount of preparation?—Yes.

17748. The CHAIRMAN.—Now you are on the subject of your personal history, have you any other remarks on that subject in relation to the inspectors?—Well, I have to deal with Mr. Chambers' report on that re-inspection.

17749. Mr. HARRISON.—Have you anything more to say about Mr. Chambers' report?—His attitude during the day was that of a fault-finder, and this must have been apparent to the children. On three or four occasions during the day he found fault with the work in the hearing of the pupils. He spent a great part of the day criticising the new time-table, which I maintain was outside the scope of his inquiry. I had entered on a new year, and he was sent as inspector to examine the work for the preceding year, and he gave me no assistance in re-arranging some of the arrangements that he objected to.

17750. On what date did he come to inspect?—On the 26th of August, and the previous examination was in May, and the greater part of his notes in the Observation Book deal with defects in the time-table, and the time-table with which Mr. Chambers found fault had been approved by the inspector in charge of the circuit for the two preceding years.

17751. Mr. COWRY.—Who was in charge of the circuit?—Mr. Keith. The evidence of the Board's officials shows that when there is any defect in equipment or furniture that goes to the credit of the teacher; yet among the other defects noted in Mr. Chambers' report he states, "The desks in the junior department are too high." These desks have been in the school for over 20 years, and this fact was never noticed before, not even by Mr. Chambers himself, who spent two days in this school in October, 1901, and two days in October, 1902. In answer to question 1845, Mr. McNellie states that if the decision of the senior inspector is against the teacher, the teacher is not furnished with a copy of his report. Although Mr. Chambers decided against me, I was furnished with a very elaborate report, which I want to give in evidence before this Committee:—"The desks in the junior department are too high for the children who use them; the principal, Mr. Smyth, should make better preparation for his work. He is, as a whole, a 'good' teacher. Although there is only one meeting in the school there are two intervals for recreation—one from 10.50 till 11 o'clock and another from 12 till 12.50. This is a violation of Rule 138 (c). The entries on the time-table are indefinite. There is no provision on it for composition or manual instruction in standards 1 and 2. Object lessons in standards 1, 2 and 3 get only 30 minutes each week. Too little time is assigned to composition in the senior standards and too much to arithmetic in the junior standards. The children of third and fourth standards sit and hold their pens badly during the writing lessons. In the senior standards the written exercises are very neatly executed, and most of the mistakes are marked by the teacher, but they are not systematically corrected by the pupils. The mechanical part of arithmetic is well taught, but too little attention is paid to the development of the children's reasoning facilities during the instruction in this subject. I am of opinion that 'good' is the correct classification of this school as at present conducted."

17752. Mr. COWRY.—Did Mr. Honan report on the re-examination of your school?—Yes; it is not a report really, but an additional letter from Mr. Honan, who had not inspected the school in the meantime. What he says is—"I beg to say that after a careful inspection of the school I could give it no higher mark than 'good.' I mark the proficiency of the pupils in the main subjects of the programme (English and arithmetic) 'good' for the former and 'fair' for the latter; and that mark 'fair' applies to the senior pupils taught by the principal teacher and presented for mathematics. The teaching of those branches was not of such merit as would by any means deserve to be classed as 'very good.' Reading

1926 July, 1933.]

MR. JOSEPH SMITH, B.A., B.Sc., examined.

[Continued]

generally lacked expression; the longer words were shunned, and there was scarcely any attempt at intonation. These defects applied to all standards; and in standards 1 and 2 oral composition and explanation were poor, and in standards 5 to 7 the answering on the subject matter of an Historical Reader was only 'fair' at most. Compositions were only 'good' at the most. As this most important subject was taught only twice a week, the proficiency could scarcely be expected to be higher. Writing was good as regards the formation of the letters, but the method of holding the pen was faulty, and imitated against freedom in the use of the pen.

17753. Mr. HARRISON.—When was that report written?—Six weeks after the re-inspection.

17754. Was that what is called an interim report?—We have no technical term for it in this country.

17755. Mr. HARRISON.—He did not visit the school at all?—He did not visit the school on this occasion; he confirmed his previous decision.

17756. The *Brecon or Ross*.—His report was dated the 15th of May?—Yes.

17757. Mr. HARRISON.—That is supplementary; because he had already reported, and you had appealed, and you had a report on the re-inspection, and then you got this other report without a visit?—Yes.

17758. Do I understand that?—Yes.

17759. The *Brecon or Ross*.—Did that come to you from the Board?—Yes, those two came together.

17760. The *Cherriman*.—What was the date of Mr. Homan's letter?—The letter is dated the 10/9/12.

17761. Mr. HARRISON.—Then it comes in not as a report but as a sort of explanatory letter?—Yes; those two came with a covering letter from the office to the manager saying:—"Rev. Sir.—With reference to previous correspondence relative to the merit mark assigned to the above-named school at the general re-inspection of May last, I am directed by the Commissioners of National Education to inform you that after consideration of the defects observed by the senior inspector at his visit of 10th August, and of the particulars set forth by Mr. Homan in a letter of 10th September, they are satisfied that the school did not merit a higher mark than that awarded on the general report. Extracts from the inspectors' report and letter are enclosed for your information. I am to add that the custom in the school of a second interval (10.30 to 11 o'clock) violates the Rule 128 (c), and is to be discontinued. The Commissioners also decline to exempt pupils of standards 1 and 2 from learning manual instruction, as laid down in the school programme. I am, rev. sir, your obedient servant, W. J. Dilworth." In reply to that report, I applied for a further inspection, and this is a copy of the letter, dated 6th November, 1912:—"Rev. Sir.—I enclose herewith a statement for consideration in connection with your application on my behalf to have the merit mark of this school for the past year awarded. I consider that in simple justice Mr. Chambers should have told me that he visited for the purpose of re-inspection, and that he should have inquired into any defects alleged by Mr. Homan. I have conclusive proof that Mr. Homan's observations and his merit mark did not fairly represent the work done in the school during the past year, but at the re-inspection I was afforded no opportunity of producing this evidence. The Resident Commissioner will be able to form an opinion of the spirit in which the re-inspection was conducted when it is pointed out to him that both Mr. Chambers' report and Mr. Homan's letter (dated 19/9/12) deal almost entirely with the work for which I am personally responsible. In his report Mr. Chambers states, 'The principal, Mr. Smyth, should make better preparation for his work.' I submitted to Mr. Chambers a complete scheme of history lessons for the year, with copious notes; a composition scheme, which includes a large portion of the grammar work for the year, with notes; a scheme of drawing, containing freshened copies, geometrical problems, and a list of objects for object drawing. I have also, in addition to the organizer's notes, very complete notes on the elementary science course; a scheme of physical drill exercises, and a large number of notes of geography lessons; but as these were not required on the day of his visit, Mr.

Chambers did not see them. So far from expressing any appreciation of this preparation, Mr. Chambers remarked that these were not what the Commissioners required. In addition to the preparation to which I have referred, I make out each afternoon an outline of the proposed work for the following day, specifying the examples to be worked in arithmetic, the subjects for composition, errors to be corrected, sentences for analysis, &c., with references to detailed notes where necessary. I am able to state that on no occasion since I took up duty here, two years ago, has this daily preparation been omitted. On the date of his visit Mr. Chambers saw my outline of the day's work, but objected that I had not teaching notes for multiplication of money by 100, 400, &c., nor for finding the weight of 1 c.o. of water. I am a first of first class teacher, a graduate in Arts of the Royal University, and a graduate in Science of London University, and have twenty years' experience in teaching. I am quite sure that under those circumstances the Resident Commissioner does not expect me to make out such notes as Mr. Chambers required. I consider Mr. Chambers' statement is misleading and unfair to me. In the opinion of Mr. Chambers, I deserve to rank only as a 'good' teacher. I beg to refer to the reports of Mr. O'Connell, Mr. Kelly, and Mr. Welpy, all of whom reported my school in *Dumurry* as 'very good,' and both Mr. Kelly and Mr. Welpy commended the very satisfactory work done in the senior standards."

17762. That was not the same school?—No; but I consider that I was in Lisburn doing quite as good work, and that the circumstances were more favourable in Lisburn. I go on to say:—"The following are extracts from the reports of those inspectors:—'This school is well organised, and it is efficiently conducted. The teachers are capable, industrious and successful. The tone, order and discipline are quite satisfactory' (that is Mr. O'Connell, 8th May, 1904). 'The teachers in this school are capable and efficient. The organisation and discipline are very good, and the progress of the pupils have been highly satisfactory' (Mr. O'Connell, 2nd June, 1905). 'The higher standards gave evidence of sound and effective teaching' (Mr. Kelly, 17th May, 1905). 'This school maintains a high standard of efficiency. The general efficiency was very satisfactory. The pupils evinced considerable intelligence, and in the matter of cleanliness of person and attire they left nothing to be desired' (Mr. Kelly, 24th June, 1907). 'The general proficiency of this school continues to be 'very good'; the principals and first assistant's part of the work being in particular very well done' (Mr. Welpy, 17th June, 1908). During the two years succeeding this I was engaged as lecturer in mathematics in the Belfast Technical School. The following is the report of the inspectors of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction on the teaching of mathematics in the Trade Preparatory School for the year 1909/10:—"A very high standard has again been reached in the teaching of mathematics; the pupils work accurately, and are able to apply the principles they have learned to new problems. Mr. Keith, in the report of his inspection of this school, on the 9th June, 1911, states:—"The teachers are skilful, and make satisfactory preparation."

17763. The *Brecon or Ross*.—The report immediately before was from the Department of Agriculture?—Yes.

17764. And when you say "this school," do you mean the Department of Agriculture again?—No; that is my new school at Lisburn.

17765. Mr. HARRISON.—What merit mark has your present school got before you went there?—"Good."

17766. And had it ever had more?—"Excellent."

17767. And when did it drop?—Two years previously. I now give extracts from Mr. Chambers' reports and reply to each:—"The entries on the time-table are indefinite." Mr. Chambers took exception to one entry only, viz., "writing and dictation." Without expressing any opinion as to whether this entry is sufficiently explicit, I venture to submit that one such entry does not justify the general statement of Mr. Chambers, "There is no provision for composition in standards 1 and 2. Oral

18th July, 1913.]

Mr. JOSEPH SLYTH, B.A., B.Sc., examined.

[Continued.]

composition only is required in these standards, and the subject was carefully taught in connection with reading, object lessons, and conversational history lessons." My reason for entering "writing and dictation" on the time-table was that I followed the nomenclature I found on the official time-table.

17768. And the words are the same as on the official time-table?—Yes. Then, "Object lessons in standards 1 to 3 get only 30 minutes each week." It was never before suggested to me that this time was insufficient. (That was the only time I had been given to composition in the senior standards.) I had provided 30 minutes more per week for this subject than was provided in time-table for former years which were officially sanctioned.

17769. And the result is that you got another inspection?—Yes.

17770. Let us have that, please?—There are a couple of matters in Mr. Hanson's letter that I desire to point out. Mr. Hanson has not dealt with any of the matters complained of in my letter of the 11th of June, but he mentions a number of new defects which were not referred to in the Observation Book or in his reports. Instead, he alleges a number of new defects which were not referred to either in the Observation Book or in his reports. The unfairness of this method of procedure must surely be apparent to anyone. I referred in the above-mentioned letter to his method of estimating the work in arithmetic in Standards 1 to 4. He makes no reference to my complaint, but adds that the mark "fair" applies also to the senior pupils taught by the principal teacher and presented for mathematics. In standard 6 only two questions in arithmetic were set by him, viz.—1. "I gave away two-fifths of my money and had 16/8 left, how much did I give away?" 2. "The rim of a wheel is 39·37" round; how many turns will it make in going 2 miles 1 furlong 20 perches?" I wish to point out very particularly that 16/8 divided by 8 gives a fractional result. Without a knowledge, therefore, of multiplication and division of vulgar fractions, which is not required for standard 5, this question could not be worked. With regard to question 2, it is explicitly stated in the Notes for Teachers, page 37—"That children in the fifth standard might learn to multiply and divide decimal numbers by any integers. The general multiplication and division of decimals should be left over until the children have thoroughly mastered the multiplication and division of vulgar fractions." Thus, the inspector set two sixth standard questions to fifth standard, and not a single question in their own course, and on the answering of the class in this test he assigns his mark. Surely, this is too bad. I give some extracts from Mr. Hanson's letter—"Reading generally lacked expression; the longer words were slurred; there was scarcely any attempt at intonation." I do not hesitate to say that this is unfair criticism. "In standards 1 and 2 oral composition and explanation were poor." Mr. Hanson made no reference to this alleged defect either in the Observation Book or in his report, so that further comment is needless. "In standards 5 to 7 the answering on the subject matter of an historical reader was only fair at most." Mr. Hanson's examination in history consisted of a few questions about Pygmalion's Ark, which is outside the course selected, and was only mentioned incidentally in the lesson for the day. In view of the above statement, I respectfully request you to apply for another inspection.

17771-2. Mr. HARRISON.—What was the result of that? You might have left out all that, and said you challenged the report, and applied for another inspection, because this is a waste of time.

The CHAIRMAN.—If we went into every question of this kind we might be sitting for five years?—Mr. McNeill re-inspected on the 5th of December.

17773. Was he chief inspector then?—Yes.

17774. Mr. HARRISON.—That is the 5th of December last year?—Yes. His estimate of my school was "very good," and I received my increment which had been refused; but although seven months have passed since that inspection, his report has not yet been furnished, and my manager has not received any official communication that I deserve to be classed

higher than a "good" teacher. This is the re-inspection referred to in Mr. McNeill's evidence on pages 68 and 69 of the Blue Book.

17775. But, as a matter of fact, you got your increment?—Yes.

17776. Mr. COOPER.—But the inferior mark remained?—Yes.

17777. The CHAIRMAN.—As far as you know?—Yes.

17778. Does it remain still?—Yes, you have it in the evidence.

17779. Mr. HARRISON.—You have not stated in your evidence that you did get your increment?—Mr. Hanson inspected again on the 10th and 11th of June of this year. On the 10th of June he spent from 9.55 to 3.5 and on the 11th of June from 9.55 to 1.5, and he has marked the school again as "good," though the chief inspector said that it took him only 30 minutes to find out that the school deserved "very good" in December, and I had been working this school, I can assure this Committee, all I was able to do.

17780. The CHAIRMAN.—Would your marks technically justify your getting increment last April?—No. "Good" would not; "very good" was necessary.

17781. Mr. HARRISON.—No report resulted from his visit?—Absolutely none.

17782. That is the end of No. 2, and will you now go on to No. 3?—I think I have dealt with that.

17783. It does seem to me that practically in the course of your evidence on No. 2 you have said all that you could say on that?—Yes.

17784. The CHAIRMAN.—And what you have mentioned is the concrete example you intended to give of that?—Yes.

17785. Mr. HARRISON.—Then we may leave that, and pass on to the question of uniformity of inspection, and I may say at once that your evidence has already shown that there is no uniformity between Mr. McNeill and Mr. Hanson, for instance; and I may tell you also that we have had an overwhelming amount of evidence on this point, so that I really think I can speak for the Committee when I say that it is not necessary that we should have any more. Now will you come on to 5?—I wish now to place before the Committee the circumstances under which my promotion to first of first grade was refused in April, 1901. Mr. Kelly, senior inspector, visited my school on 16th May, 1901, and reported me for punishing a boy and not making a record of the punishment in the Corporal Punishment Book. On 23rd June the manager was asked to admonish me for infringement of the official instructions. Mr. Purcell, in evidence, in answer to question 3315, makes a distinction between an admonition and a reprimand or censure. He says—"We regard a reprimand as the most serious thing short of a fine." He evidently wishes to convey the idea that even for a reprimand a fine is not inflicted. In circular to inspectors, March, 1906 (Appendix to Report, page 145), it is stated that "Teachers who have incurred any serious censure during the three preceding years are ineligible for promotion." In view of these facts the following three letters, received in reply to inquiries made by my manager, deserve attention; the dates of the letters also show the way that the teachers are kept in suspense. The first is:—"Office of National Education, Dublin, 20th November, 1906.—Rev. Sir.—Referring to your letter of 14th ult., relative to the question of the promotion of Mr. Joseph Smyth, principal teacher of the above-named school, to the first division of first grade, I am directed to inform you that there is correspondence pending with the Government and the Lords of His Majesty's Treasury in regard to this and other similar cases, and that the Commissioners are unable to give any decision as to Mr. Smyth's promotion for the present. I am, rev. sir, your obedient servant.—P. E. LEMAS."

17786. The CHAIRMAN.—What was the date of that admonition?—The 30rd of June, 1906.

17787. The CHAIRMAN.—When you were in Dunmurry?—Yes. The second letter is:—"Dublin, 19th January, 1907.—Rev. Sir.—Referring to previous correspondence, I am directed to inform you that the Commissioners of National Education have had under consideration the question of the promotion of Mr. Joseph Smyth to the first division of first grade, and I have to inform you that Mr. Smyth's record is not

17791. sufficiently satisfactory to warrant the Commissioners in granting such promotion. I am, rev. sir, your obedient servant—P. E. LEMASSE. The manager wrote for further information, and asked for an explanation, and a reply came, dated the 8th April, 1907:—"Rev Sir—Referring to your letter of the 7th ultimo, as to the question of promotion of Mr. Joseph Smyth, principal teacher of the above-named school, I am directed to remind you that on the 23rd June, 1906, Mr. Smyth was admonished on his infringement of the official instructions regarding the infliction of corporal punishment reported by the senior inspector in connection with his visits of the 10th and 17th May, 1905, and to say that in view of this admonition his promotion to first division of first grade from 1st April, 1906, has been refused. His claims will be reconsidered in due course during the present year. I am, rev. sir, your obedient servant—P. E. LEMASSE." The result was that my promotion was delayed, and they gave me promotion a year later. I have never yet been able to ascertain why the Commissioners were in communication with the Lords of His Majesty's Treasury in November, 1906, seeing that the reason given on the 7th April, 1907, for refusing to promote me was a breach of their own official regulations. I subsequently was promoted from 1st April, 1907. The pecuniary loss to me on account of this admonition was at least £48. The senior inspector assured me at his next inspection that he had not anticipated such serious consequence to me from this admonition.

17793-00. Mr. CONVEY.—It appears an extraordinary thing that on the 30th November, 1906, the Commissioners should write to you that they could not give any decision till they heard from the Treasury. Six months later they took up the position that you were kept out of promotion by being admonished.

The CHAIRMAN.—In the previous letter they seemed to recognise his right, but they could not get the money for it, and three months later they maintained the position that he had not deserved it.

Mr. HARRISON.—It amounts to this. I suppose that the point of what you have told us is that an admonition, contrary to the evidence that has been given us, may result in a loss of increment?—Yes; that is exactly the point I want to bring before the Committee.

17791. And do you further say that admonition on such a subject as failure to comply with a very small regulation should not entail pecuniary loss?—The evidence of Mr. Purcell was that admonition never entailed a fine.

17793. Mr. CONVEY.—You calculate that you have already lost £48?—I have already lost £34, and I will lose £24 more.

17795. You went away and you resumed again?—Yes.

17794. And how far that would affect you I do not know?—I resumed at the salary I had when I left off, so that as far as the National Board is concerned, these two years are a blank with them.

17796. Mr. HARRISON.—We may now pass on to the next stage. I say at once, with regard to the suggestions you make in your paper, that they have all been before us, and they are all points on which we have had a very large amount of evidence, and which are perfectly certain to be carefully considered. If you have anything at all further to add by all means do so, and, if not, I think it would be quite sufficient if you merely got on to the notes what your suggestions are very shortly. Do you agree with that plan?—Yes.

17796. Now, with regard to increment being annual and automatic, I can tell you at once that I think it is very doubtful if there is anything that you can tell us that we do not know about that?—I do not want to speak on the subject at all if you have already had sufficient evidence.

17797. Mr. HENLEY.—It is your evidence that you wish increments to be annual and automatic?—Yes.

17798. Mr. HARRISON.—Now, you think an inspector should be allowed to remain a considerable number of years in the same circuit?—Yes.

17799. You say, "I have been inspected by ten inspectors in eleven years." I may say at once that

there is nothing new that you can tell us on that subject. Then your next is, "There should be frequent conferences between inspectors and teachers"—I think that is important.

17800. Well, we had very full evidence on that this morning, but it is possible that you might like to add something to that?—These should take place chiefly when there is a change of inspectors and a new inspector comes into a circuit, or when there is a change in the curriculum, so that the teachers will have an opportunity of meeting the inspector and getting notice at once of any instructions which the inspectors receive from the office. For example, in this first volume of evidence there is a vast amount of instructions issued to inspectors which I never saw till this volume was published, and it would be extremely useful to the teacher if he had an opportunity of knowing what those instructions to the inspector were.

17801. It is possible that they would not be at liberty to make them public. If they were only issued as confidential instructions, I do not suppose that they could let you into the secret?—Another point is that when a new inspector comes to a circuit he frequently finds fault with arrangements that have pleased his predecessor. If, when he came to the circuit, there was a conference between him and the teachers, and the methods were generally discussed, the teachers would soon get into his way of looking at things which would prevent all this writing in the pages of the Observation Book on a visit from a new inspector.

17802. Then, shall we go on to the next point. You think there should be real examination or inspection and not perfunctory examination. I think the best plan would be to give one or two instances of what you mean by that?—Well, Mr. Homan examined the fourth standard in arithmetic, the examination consisting of one problem being given to each child in the class. I do not think that is a fair test of a class.

In the examination in history, which I specify, he reported that the answering on the subject matter of an historical reader was only "fair." He gave a few questions only on a matter which was outside our course for the year, and based his conclusion on the answering to those few questions. If he wants inspection and wishes to inspect the merit of the work done, by all means let him do so as clearly as possible; but if he wants to examine, let it be an examination over the whole course, for we do not want him to base his report on answers to a few questions.

17803. You say that if an examination is held a teacher should be allowed to exclude backward or irregular pupils?—Yes. The point I wish to make with regard to that is chiefly in regard to examination in extra subjects. A class is presented, say, in algebra, a class of 12, and there are probably two pupils to whom it is impossible to teach algebra. Those two are put in with the others, and their marks are put with those of the others, and they reduce the percentage very considerably.

17804. Why are those pupils in the class at all?—Well, you do not know at the beginning of the year how the pupils might develop. The roll is marked from the beginning of the year.

17805. Then it comes to this, that you want to be paid for pupils who ought not to be in the class, because they are incapable of receiving instruction?—No; I wish at the end of the year to exclude the attendance of those pupils, and also to exclude the pupils themselves from the examination.

17806. You want to exclude them and their attendances?—Oh, yes.

17807. That is a quite clear point?—I raised that point with Mr. Homan, and he refused to allow me.

17808. I do not suppose he had power to do so?—I do not suppose he had.

17809. But at any rate that is one suggestion. Then we come to the next, in which you say there should not be undue interference with the organization of the school?—I think I have dealt with that very fully in regard to interference by Mr. Chambers in the arrangement of my time-table.

17810. Then, the next is that there should be a satisfactory court of appeal in case of disputes between inspectors and teachers?—Yes.

[24th July, 1932.]

Mr. JOSEPH SMYTH, B.A., B.Sc., examined.

[Continued.]

17811. Have you any definite proposal to make about that?—I have no definite proposal. The point I want to make is to prevent the appeal against the junior inspector going to the senior inspector; that is, an appeal from one man to his colleague, and that colleague himself responsible for the work of the junior inspector; so that in appealing to the senior inspector we would be appealing to one who is responsible for the work upon which he is called to adjudicate.

17812. What you would like is to have an appeal to an inspector who was entirely outside the circuit and who knew nothing about the school before?—Yes, if possible; who knew nothing about the circumstances.

17813. That in your main point?—Yes; the point is that we have no confidence in the present appeals.

17814. That is to say, you have no confidence in the appeal from a sectional inspector to a senior inspector?—No.

17815. Mr. HENRY.—You have the Blue Book there, and you see question 1562 on page 36. I think you have read that question and the answer?—Yes; I have read that question and answer.

17816. Would you think that the evidence there given by Mr. McNeill with regard to preparation is reasonable?—No, certainly not.

17817. You think it reasonable?—Yes, I think that quite reasonable.

17818. Then did your own inspector in the preparation expect you to exceed the requirements there laid down by Mr. McNeill?—Yes, very much.

17819. Now, in reference to the appeal with regard to your school, you understood that the merit mark of the school was raised from "good" to "very good"?—Yes.

17820. And that as a consequence of the raising of the mark you got your increment?—Yes.

17821. Do you think it is fair after the mark has been raised to "very good" the erroneous mark, as far as the record of your school is concerned, should remain as it was?—I think it is most unfair to me professionally, apart altogether from the question of money. Professionally, I think it is most unfair that though the chief inspector gave me "very good" yet I have no record of that.

17822. What do you think ought to have been done in the case?—Well, I should think that as the chief inspector is the highest authority, and his decision was in my favour, an official communication should have been sent to the manager and me to myself.

17823. Do you think the old report ought to have been cancelled and his report substituted?—Yes, decidedly.

17824. And as long as that is not done you think that, irrespective of any increment or promotion, the teacher is unfairly dealt with?—Yes, he is unfairly dealt with.

17825. You worked for some time under the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction?—Yes.

17826. Had you experience of the inspectors of the Department?—Yes I had, for two years; and also for three years since I have been an extern teacher under the Department. I have met the inspectors of the Department for the last five years.

17827. Now, can you tell us briefly in what way their mode of procedure differs from that of the inspectors under the National Board?—Suppose I describe an incidental visit of each to a school. When one of the Department's inspectors enters a classroom, he immediately goes to the teacher's platform and speaks a friendly word of greeting to the teacher. He examines the syllabus of the class, and ascertains how much of the course the teacher has already covered; he discusses the method of dealing with portion of the syllabus, and if the teacher has any difficulty, the advice of the inspector is given to help him. All the time the teacher feels that the sole object of the visit is to help him to make his instruction more efficient and more beneficial to his students. On the other hand, the greeting—if there is one—of one of the National Board's inspectors could seldom be described as friendly. He walks round, with pencil in hand; his sole object seems to be to get copy for his note-book. At the end of the visit portion of the

copy is transcribed in the Observation Book. Probably not half a dozen words are exchanged with any member of the teaching staff. There is no co-operation between inspector and teacher; if a teacher has a difficulty he would not think of consulting the inspector. In the one case the teacher has a friend and adviser; in the other, he has to deal with one who is trying to find out and emphasise his weak points without giving him any assistance in strengthening them.

17828. With reference to that point, that there should be real examination or inspection, I infer that you do not object to either the examination of your pupils or the inspection of your methods?—No, provided that the examination is a fair one, and covers the whole course.

17829. And with regard to arithmetic you object, and I think justly object, to the knowledge of your pupils being tested by one or two questions?—Yes, most decidedly.

17830. What do you think should be done?—Well, they should be given at least, I should say, about five questions, and among those questions there should be some covering the easier portions of the course as well as the more difficult portions.

17831. In other words, you think it is unjust to concentrate the whole examination on one or two portions of the programme?—Yes, on one or two problems, which is very often done.

17832. With regard to the subject matter of history, in which you say Mr. Hogan only asked a few questions with reference to Poyning's Law, what suggestions have you to make as to how the examination should be conducted?—In a subject like history or geography, where different methods may be employed, before an inspector should report adversely, the teacher should be allowed to examine the class on the lines on which the class has been taught, and then, if necessary, let the inspector put some supplementary questions on the same lines.

17833. Or on any other lines?—Well, provided it does not exceed the course the teacher has taught.

17834. Is a word, you think the examination ought to be confined to the school record?—Absolutely so.

17835. And then the teacher ought to get an opportunity on every occasion of showing what the pupils know?—Quite so.

17836. Instead of leaving it entirely to the inspectors who sometimes want to find out what the pupils don't know?—Yes; that is my point.

17837. With reference to the point you raised regarding mathematics, all the pupils of a class are enrolled on a special roll for mathematics at the beginning of the year?—Yes; from the 1st of July.

17838. Supposing you are working for six months, is there anything to prevent you from excluding a dull or backward pupil from that class?—I do not think that there is any regulation dealing with it at the end of six months, but you must cancel the attendance.

17839. Exactly. But supposing you do, would not that meet the point that you raised there?—Yes; that might meet the point.

17840. So that the matter is really in your own hands?—Yes; that would probably meet that point.

17841. I think you said you have not considered what would be a satisfactory court of appeal beyond having the chief inspector?—No, I have not any solution for that difficulty. I think that when we had the head inspector formerly it was much more satisfactory than appealing to the senior inspector, because the senior inspector is really responsible for the efficiency of the schools under the district inspector.

17842. There is a point that you have not touched on in your petition. Do you think it is a satisfactory arrangement to have a senior inspector and circuit inspectors working together in the same circuit and not one of them really responsible for any portion of the work?—No; I think it is a very bad arrangement for the education of the country. Each inspector should be responsible for his own circuit, without interference from the senior inspector.

17843. Except in case of complaint?—Except in case of complaint.

17844. And that he should be held responsible for the efficiency?—And that he should be held responsible for the efficiency of the schools; and if after a number of years schools were found not efficient or the organisation defective he should be held responsible for that.

17845. Mr. KAVANAGH.—You said you did work under the Department of Agriculture?—Yes.

17846. Did the inspector's report affect the salary?—No, it had no effect whatever on the salary.

17847. Well, that makes all the difference, does it not?—I mean that the inspector going about has power of affecting the salary as being the awarder of a merit mark?—Yes, quite so.

17848. Would that be an extra argument in favour of automatic increments?—Yes; there will never be really hearty co-operation between inspectors and teachers so long as the teacher's increment depends so much on the report of the inspectors. It is most injurious to the educational efficiency of the country, and causes a great deal of friction.

17849. Would that take away the inducement to a teacher to improve himself?—What do you mean by "improve"?—

17850. If the increment was automatic there would be possibly no inducement to the teacher to improve?—Well, I think his professional reputation and the local opinion in the district would be a sufficient incentive.

17851. I am asking you whether it would take away an incentive, because there are a great number of teachers in the world who are not all like yourself, and if you took away the money inducement some of them might be inclined to fall back?—I think, as a whole, the teachers would do more efficient work.

17852. And you think the relations between yourselves and the inspectors would be more friendly if your salaries were not to depend on their reports?—Yes, decidedly so.

17853. Now, with regard to the equipment and cleaning of the school, have you had to supply any equipment for years back?—Well, I may say that in that respect I have been extremely fortunate. With regard to my school in Dunmurry, there was a lady, a patron of the school, Miss Charley. She provided everything for the upkeep of the school. In my present school there is a Board of Governors, and they make themselves responsible for all the expenses connected with the school, and there is an endowment for the upkeep of the building, so that personally I have nothing to complain of under that head.

17854. Have you known such cases in your own personal knowledge?—I have known a considerable number of cases, but I am not prepared to put them before the Committee now, as I have not come provided with data under this head.

17855. You are in the very advantageous position of having a very well equipped school?—I would not say very well equipped; fairly well equipped.

17856. It would not detract from your merit mark. You have to pay nothing?—Nothing.

17857. Had you any experience of the results' system, particularly from 1889 to 1901?—Yes.

17858. Do you think the present system of education is as useful to the children in after-life as the old system—that is, examination as against the inspection system?—Personally, I would not like to see the system of education going back to the old method of individual examination, and I should say that the present system was an improvement in one respect; that is, with regard to English composition; but, on the other hand, I do not think arithmetic is nearly so accurate under the present system as under the old system.

17859. Every witness here told us that arithmetic has suffered?—I can personally recollect that as a National School pupil I had learned, at the age of 16, discount, compound interest, progression, and scales of notation, and so forth; in fact a full course in arithmetic. You will not get any pupils of a National School at the present time who will be able to do that.

17860. Have you heard it stated by large employers that education at present is not as good for their purposes as under the results' system?—Yes, I have heard that; and I find it stated in the report of a Civil Service Institute in Belfast that it is a well-known fact in Ireland that pupils do not come from the National School as well prepared as they did some years ago.

17861. Is it that you are trying to teach too many subjects?—Yes, the curriculum is at present too large.

17862. And would you advise a smaller curriculum?—Yes.

17863. The last witness told us that inspectors were fond of going back to the examination system. Would that be your opinion?—Mr. McNeill was the only inspector I ever saw inspecting a school on the methods outlined by himself before this Committee. The others are basing their opinion very largely on an examination more or less extended.

17864. They are rather going back to the results' system of individual examination?—Except, of course, that they substitute class examination now for individual examination.

17865. The BRIDGE or ROSS.—You have very good reasons to object to perfunctory examination, and you also said that you would not like to go back to the individual examination of children; and then, too, you said that you would wish a school to be judged either by inspection or by full examination?—Quite so.

17866. Could you have the examination, from your point of view, sufficiently full without examining the individual children, or whether do you prefer inspection or examination?—I prefer inspection. The examination should be done by the teacher, and the inspection should be done by the inspectors. And, furthermore, they should give the teachers some help in the discharge of their duties and not merely note defects on their visits.

17867. You agree pretty much with Mr. McNeill's view?—Yes, pretty nearly.

17868. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—As a matter of practice, what is done in the course of the year by teachers in the way of examination?—Personally, my method is to examine the whole school, every pupil in every subject, three times a year—before the Christmas holidays, before the Easter holidays, and at the end of the year, in June.

17869. And you find that that is to the advantage of their education?—I think it is.

17870. The CHAIRMAN.—Do you keep records of those examinations?—Yes.

17871. And the marks of the individual pupils?—The marks of each individual pupil in each subject, and those marks are suspended in the school as an inducement to the pupils.

17872. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—That is not in the progress record?—Oh, no; the progress record merely contains the amount you have covered in each subject in each class.

17873. And you hang that up in the school, and you find that the pupils do take an interest in their position there?—Yes, quite so.

17874. Do the parents ask for it?—Well, as a matter of fact, the school is used as a public hall, and most of the parents visit the school at different meetings.

17875. And they have an opportunity of seeing that without making special inquiries?—Yes.

17876. And really, then, the progress of the pupils and their position in the class is made public to all those who frequent that place?—Yes.

17877. Mr. CONWAY.—I have only one question. How can you account for the fact that you and Mr. Chambers, the senior inspector, did not discuss matters connected with your school, for he is a very sensible and capable man—is there any special reason why you and he did not discuss matters in connection with the organisation of your school?—Well, he is an officer who takes precedence of me, and if he wants a subject discussed it is his place to initiate the discussion. I am quite willing to discuss it.

17878. And would it not be worth your while to ask his advice on some points?—Well, if I ask advice I never get any assistance.

17879. You have never tried to do it?—Yes, I have, sometimes.

17880. Because he appears to me to be a very capable man and a very conscientious man, and a man of great good sense, and I think he would be very glad if a teacher were to ask his opinion about matters?—Well, I should be most happy. I had six years of the Technical School, and I have met inspectors there, and I have got advice from them, and the teacher would go and talk freely. But there is not the same attitude on the part of our own inspectors.

17881. But he would talk with the teacher on any matter connected with the work of the school?—There was one occasion where he objected to the arrangement of my time-table. I was in the habit of having a half-hour for home lessons, and he objected to the school having a half-hour for home lessons, and that meant a re-arrangement of my time-table, and I wanted him to show me how the time-table could be adjusted to suit this, and he got into difficulties before he had got far, and told me I could do it myself.

17882. Mr. HENRY.—Are you not allowed to have home lessons under the present regulations?—No, sir; both Mr. Chambers and Mr. Homan object.

17883. But the Board?—You are not allowed to put a definite half-hour on the time-table for the hearing of home lessons. Mr. Chambers was showing me how

to mark the home exercises during school hours according to his plan, and when I was showing him that the plan that he advocated was impossible, then he says, "You cannot mark the home exercises inside school hours."

17884. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—You give home lessons?—Yes; generally one oral home lesson and one written lesson each day.

17885. The CHAIRMAN.—The Board at one time did encourage the giving of home lessons?—Yes, but they almost prohibited it some years ago.

17886. Mr. HENRY.—Now they say that was a mistake?—Yes; they found out that it was a mistake, and I think it was a very grave mistake.

17887. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—As a matter of fact the mistake was intimated in a circular to the inspectors, I believe?—Yes, I think so.

17888. Was that communicated to you?—No, we did not receive any notice of that, so far as I recollect.

17889. Have you ever seen any circulars until they were published in our report?—There were one or two issued some years ago.

17890. But, as a rule, you never saw them?—As a rule I never saw them till I saw them here in this report.

THIRTY-NINTH DAY.—TUESDAY, JULY 22ND, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present.—Sir SAMUEL DELA, M.A., LL.D., LL.B. (Chairman); The Most Rev. DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross; Sir HIRSH WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN CONVEY; Mr. HENRAGE E. B. HARRISON, B.A.; Mr. JEREMIAH HENLEY; Mr. WALTER McMURROUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.; Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL KETTLE, B.L.; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Mr. THOMAS JAMISON, B.A., Principal Teacher of Madril Street National School, Belfast, examined.

17891. The CHAIRMAN.—You have been in the service of the Board since the 1st of April, 1893?—That is so.

17892. As assistant in this same school all the time down to 1897?—Yes.

17893. On the 1st of April, 1899, you succeeded Mr. Elliott, whom we have had here?—Yes, sir.

17894. So that now you have been four years principal of this school?—That is so.

17895. Now, as to your record. In 1893 you were promoted?—Yes, to first division of third class after one year's efficient service; in 1894, to the second division of second class, after efficient service and examination; 1895, first division of second class, after one year's efficient service; 1896, admitted to Marlborough Street Training College for one year; 1897, promoted to second division of first class by examination on leaving Training College, 1898, awarded teaching diploma, after two years' efficient service; 1899, awarded first increment of £7, after three years' efficient service; 1900, awarded second increment of £7, after three years' efficient service; 1900, promoted by manager to the principalship of Madril Street School on Mr. Elliott's retirement on full pension.

17896. What was your salary as assistant?—It was £85, plus capitation grant, plus Birrell grant.

17897. What did that amount to?—£235, and £5 Birrell grant, and capitation, £8 15s. 6d.; that is, £240 15s. 6d.

17898. That was your salary as assistant when you became principal?—Yes.

17899. Who is your manager?—Dr. Gibson, of Mount Pottinger, Belfast.

17900. You were appointed by the manager to the principalship of the school in 1899 on Mr. Elliott's retirement on full pension?—Yes.

17901. When the grade system was introduced in 1899 how did it affect your position?—In 1899 the grade system was introduced, and I was depressed to the lowest rank, third grade, under the new system. I was, however, placed in second grade on my appointment to principalship in 1900, and in that rank I still remain. I am, therefore, an undergraded teacher.

17902. You are in the second grade now?—Second.

17903. And what is your salary as principal?—£96, the grade salary; the Birrell grant of £7, and £17 of capitation grant—about £120.

17904. Is that all?—That is all from the Board.

17905. And how long have you been in second grade?—Since I became principal, four years ago.

17906. When was your last increment?—I got an increment of £11 when I had been almost two years principal, and the increment was paid back from the date of my appointment as principal.

17907. Mr. HENLEY.—What is the average of your school?—It varies from 130 to 140. I could have a larger average, but owing to the space regulation I am precluded from taking all the pupils that come.

17908. The CHAIRMAN.—How many assistants have you?—Three. In 1902 the report was "good"; in 1903 it was "good"; in 1904, "good" (by Mr. Chambers); 1905, "good" (by Mr. Chambers); 1906, "good" (by Mr. O'Connell); 1907, "good" (by Mr. O'Connell); 1908, "fair" (by Mr. Fenton); 1909, "fair" (by Mr. Dewar).

22nd July, 1918.]

17908. Mr. CONWAY.—Were all the circuit inspectors there together—Mr. Dewar, Mr. Fenton, and Mr. O'Connell?—No; Mr. O'Connell was the inspector of the section, and was succeeded by Mr. Homan.

17909. Mr. HANLY.—Who were the three inspectors in your district?—Mr. Dewar was the senior inspector; Mr. McMillan was the inspector of section B, and Mr. Homan of section A.

17910. Mr. CONWAY.—And then Mr. Fenton?—Mr. Fenton was unattached at the time.

17911. The CHAIRMAN.—Will you continue the reports you had since you were appointed principal?—In 1909 I got "fair" from Mr. Cole, a junior unattached; in 1911, "fair" from Mr. McMillan; in 1912, "fair" from Mr. Keith; in 1913, "good" from Mr. Keith, followed by Mr. Kelly.

17912. Who were your inspectors at the time you got "good"?—Mr. Kelly and Mr. Keith. Mr. Kelly the senior inspector and Mr. Keith the district inspector.

17913. And they succeeded Mr. Dewar and Mr. Homan?—Yes.

17914. You make a charge about Mr. Dewar sending inspectors from other districts to examine you?—Yes, that is so.

17915. Your own inspector did not examine you for several years?—For four years the section inspector never inspected the school. From were the last four years that Mr. Dewar had charge of the circuit.

17916. What account can you give of that?—I can only surmise that Mr. Dewar was not too friendly to the school.

17917. Have you known instances of other cases of schools inspected for four years by persons outside the circuit?—Well, the only evidence I can give on that point is this list, which I believe is in the hands of the Committee. I have looked through the list, and I have not found it happen in a single school, and I believe it has not happened in a single one of our Belfast schools except this.

17918. You refer to your private personal mark since 1903?—Yes; my private personal mark since 1903, as set forth in the first report of the Board's Accountant concerning my case as an undergraded teacher. This document was forwarded to me by the Under-Secretary, Dublin Castle, on 13th May, 1913.

17919. Give us first your personal mark as assistant?—As assistant, 1901, "fairly satisfactory"; 1902, "fairly satisfactory"; 1903, "fairly good"; 1904, "good" (by Mr. Chambers); 1905, "good" (Mr. Chambers); 1906, "good" (Mr. O'Connell); 1907, "good" (Mr. O'Connell); 1908, "good" (Mr. Fenton); 1909, "fair barely" (by Mr. Dewar).

17920. Did you know the mark you were given at the time as assistant?—No; I did not know it until I saw these private marks in the Accountant's report which I received a year ago.

17921. Did Mr. Dewar give the information to your principal at the time?—No; he made no reference to me in the Observation Book or to the manager or principal. He said nothing at all, and found no fault with me, yet he reduced my personal mark from "good" to "fair barely."

17922. So that was an attack upon your personal merit mark?—My personal merit mark. I did not know that mark till I got the list, as I told you, from the Under-Secretary. My personal mark as principal was "fair" (by Mr. Cole), in 1910; and that was followed by Mr. McMillan in 1911. I have no knowledge of my personal mark for 1912 or 1913, but it may have been raised when the merit mark of the school was raised in January of this year.

17923. The CHAIRMAN.—That was by Mr. Keith?—By Mr. Keith and Mr. Kelly. Mr. Dilworth has stated to the Committee (in answer to question 87) that when the inspectors inspected a different set of schools each year for three years, this annual change prevented them from becoming intimately acquainted with their schools, and that the system of thus changing inspectors was abandoned in 1906. If that is so, why was this school inspected by five different inspectors in five consecutive years, 1908, 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912, and, in face of their Secretary's statement, do the Commissioners claim that the school was efficiently inspected during that period.

17924. Some of those inspectors were drawn from other circuits?—Yes.

17925. And for four years you had not a circuit inspector in the school?—The section inspector did not visit the school for that period. The merit mark of the school, which had always been "good" till 1908, was reduced to "fair" by Mr. Fenton, an inexperienced junior inspector, then working under Mr. Dewar's tutelage in circuit 8. About this time I am informed Mr. Dewar boasted to Mr. Todd, principal of Ballymacarrett Road National School, Belfast, that he had told Mr. Fenton to lower away at the reports as long as he had him (Mr. Dewar) at his back.

17926. Is that report substantiated—is it founded on good evidence?—Well, Mr. Todd states that Mr. Dewar came to him on three several occasions and made that statement, and he has also referred to it in the Rejoinders. I saw Mr. Todd yesterday, and I asked him was he perfectly certain about it, and he said Yes, and that he would come before the Committee if necessary to substantiate it.

17927. Did he use those words?—Yes; that Mr. Dewar came to him on three several occasions and made this statement.

17928. Mr. KERR.—Mr. Todd told us something about that?—Yes; but I believe he was not questioned on that point.

17929. Mr. CONWAY.—Did you learn from Dr. Gibson whether any of the inspectors made a statement of that kind?—Of which kind?

17930. That they were free to reduce marks in Belfast without anyone being likely to censure them?—Well, I have had no conversation with Dr. Gibson on the point. Mr. Dewar visited the school some weeks after Mr. Fenton, and, of course, confirmed the mark. At this inspection, I may observe, Mr. Fenton showed decided antipathy to myself, and I believe his action in this respect was prompted by a desire to punish me for mentioning his conduct, in stating (on the occasion of his previous visit, 12th December, 1907), in the hearing of my class, that I should not allow a pupil to use an india-rubber.

17931. What were the causes of his antipathy to you?—What I have stated about the rubber incident. He found fault with every subject in my class throughout the inspection. For instance, he heard every pupil in the class reading. Now, I can state that there was not a single mistake made by a single pupil in the class, and Mr. Elliott told me after the inspection was over that I was the only teacher in the school that Mr. Fenton found fault with; and he has told me, said Mr. Elliott, that there is no subject in your class deserving a higher mark than "fair" or "moulding."

17932. Was his manner to you offensive?—Well, it was not over polite.

17933. He had an antipathy to you, you think?—Both in manner and in finding fault with my work. He found fault with every subject, practically, I had taught, and made grave complaints concerning my work to the principal, Mr. Elliott. In fact, the latter has informed me, as I have already mentioned, that I was the only teacher he found fault with. Now, if I was the most incompetent or the only incompetent teacher in the school, why did Mr. Fenton report to the Board that my service was "good"? I have got that in this report that I have already referred to. Mr. Webb, the Board's Accountant, gives the personal marks, and in that list my mark is "good." If the worst of the four teachers in the school was entitled to "good," why did he reduce the mark of the school to "fair"? Mr. Fenton, moreover, made no complaint of any kind concerning me or the school to the manager. I can only conclude, therefore, that his action in disparaging my work to Mr. Elliott was prompted by a desire to get me into trouble with my immediate superior, as an official set-off for the incident of 12th December. Mr. Dewar held the inspection in 1909, and kept the mark of the school at "fair." In his report, he did not refer to me in any way, nor did he make any complaint concerning my work to either the principal or manager. Yet in his private report to the Board he lowered my personal mark to "fair barely," and I had no suspicion of it until four years afterwards. This was on the eve of my promotion to the principalship of the school, and I believe it was done for a purpose.

17984. Are you convinced of that, for you are making a grave charge?—It is a grave statement; but still, in view of the fact that during the last four years Mr. Dewar had charge of the school, the circuit inspectors did not inspect it, though they inspected the other schools in the section, and in view of the further fact that since Mr. Dewar's retirement the school has been inspected in the same way as other schools in the district and the report raised, I believe I am justified in making that suggestion to the Committee. The inspection of 1910 (my last as principal) was held by Mr. Cole, a young, inexperienced junior inspector, who had received a very unfavourable character for unjust marking and lack of courtesy to teachers in at least two districts—Tipperary and West Clare. A person of that kind should not, under any circumstances, have been sent to conduct the first inspection of the school subsequent to my appointment as principal. I knew when Mr. Cole entered the school that the merit mark would not be raised.

17985. How did you know?—I felt that the standing and character of the inspector rather than the condition of the school would determine the mark.

17986. I thought you meant that you had some objection to his manner?—No, I had no objection to his manner at all right through the inspection.

17987. You thought your work would count for nothing?—I thought our year's work would count for nothing.

17988. Mr. KERRIS.—In your opinion the character of the inspector and not the condition of the school would determine the mark?—In my opinion, certainly. The report was, of course, again marked "fair." I may remark here that Mr. Dewar had visited the school some time previously, and told me I would get a "good" report. Mr. Dewar was the senior inspector. I appealed through the manager to the Education Office, and after considerable delay Mr. Dewar was sent down to the school.

17989. Mr. CORRY.—Can you tell us the date of the inspection and the date of the receipt of the warrant?—The date of the inspection was the 23rd of May, and the minute was sent out from the Education Office on the 5th of July. It came to me in the summer holidays; that is six weeks after the inspection.

17990. What was the date of the manager's appeal?—Well, I have already mentioned the fact that the report came in the July holidays, and the date of the manager's appeal was the 5th of August, on a day or two before the school re-opened.

17991. When you came back after the holidays?—When I came back after the holidays. I was on holidays during the whole month of July.

17992. Mr. HENRY.—You say Mr. Dewar was sent down to the school. When was that?—The date of Mr. Dewar's visit was the 3th of December; and I had to ask the manager to write several letters to the Education Office in the meantime, and I had also to speak to a friendly Commissioner, and ask him to get our letters attended to in the Education Office.

17993. The CHAIRMAN.—Then Mr. Dewar visited the school?—Yes; he stayed for a whole day, and appeared to be holding an inspection, but never mentioned the appeal. As the official letter which followed clearly indicated, my appeal was decided and dismissed (in the name of the Commissioners, though as a matter of fact the Commissioners had never heard of it) before Mr. Dewar's visit.

17994. Before Mr. Dewar's visit?—Yes; I will read the letter.

17995. What is the date of the letter?—25th of January, 1911, a long time after the visit of Mr. Dewar.

17996. Mr. CORRY.—On what evidence does it appear that that letter was not based on Mr. Dewar's inspection?—I shall read the letter if you wish. "Office of National Education, Dublin, 26th January, 1911.—Sir.—With reference to your letter of the 6th August last, relative to the report of the general inspection of the above-named school held by Mr. Cole, junior inspector, on the 23rd May, 1910, I am directed to inform you that having considered your letter in connection with a further report from the inspector, and having examined the reports on the work of Mr. Thomas Jamison, principal teacher, previously fur-

nished by other inspectors, the Commissioners see no reason for questioning the accuracy of Mr. Cole's report." (That was the decision I think. My appeal was dismissed then.) "In a report on this school forwarded by the senior inspector on the 24th ultimo, that officer states as follows:—'Mr. Cole, junior inspector, held the general inspection on the 23rd May, 1910, and his estimate of the work done by the teachers varies little from the judgment which I formed after my inspection on the 5th inst. Mr. Cole's ratings are very similar to my own, and even after an interval of six months, the period between the two inspections, I have come to the conclusion that Mr. Cole's general report was just and correct.' " Mr. Dewar claims that after an interval of six months he could tell what was the probable condition of the school in May. I say that he could not.

17997. The CHAIRMAN.—Is it your opinion that the Commissioners had come to the conclusion expressed in that letter before they had received Mr. Dewar's report?—That is my reading of it.

17998. That it was wholly independent of Mr. Dewar's report?—That independently of Mr. Dewar and his report, my appeal was dismissed.

17999. The CHAIRMAN.—The date of the re-examination was in December?—The 5th of December, when we had got into the new year's work, and were almost half through it. The letter from the Education Office goes on with the quotation of Mr. Dewar's report:—"The school, I am pleased to report, is now progressive, and shows an upward trend, and the teachers display an earnestness in their work, but even now the proficiency, and especially the proficiency in such branches as reading, grammar, oral composition, and arithmetic would not warrant the school to be classed as 'good.' There is a tendency in some of the pupils to stop work and to indulge in rather aimless conversation if the teacher's eye is removed from them for a short time, and so far, discipline is somewhat defective." I think I have a right to take strong exception to that observation. I think it is not right for Mr. Dewar to take a teacher's attention from the class and then to complain of the class talking. When children are left alone and have nothing to do they will talk; it is their nature.

18000. The CHAIRMAN.—Did he give you any idea when he came that he was coming to re-inspect the school, and instructed by the Board to do so?—No; and he never mentioned the appeal the whole day. This is the continuation of his report, as quoted in the letter from the Education Office:—"It may be desirable to state that I called in this school and in the adjoining infants' school on the 7th January, 1910, from 10 to 10.30 o'clock. I then expressed to the teachers my satisfaction with the division of the large room by a partition, with the general appearance of the school, and with the style of a writing lesson given to the third class by Miss Shaw; and it must be to this expression of approval the teacher adverts in his letter to me, dated 9th July, 1910. My approval only referred to the work seen by me at this first visit." In my letter to Mr. Dewar I called attention to his words to me on leaving. He stated to me, "When the inspector comes he will give you a good report." I quoted those words to him, and he is not even yet denied them. The official letter from the Education Office goes on:—"I am to state that the question of fixing Mr. Jamison's salary as principal is under consideration. In dealing with the case the Commissioners will take into account the fact that the unsatisfactory state of the school seems to be largely due to the manner in which it had been conducted by the former principal, Mr. D. Elliott, for some time prior to his retirement on pension. I am, sir, your obedient servant—W. J. Dillworth." I must say that the insinuation that Mr. Elliott neglected the school in the last two years is entirely unjustified.

18001. Is that in Mr. Dewar's report?—No; it is in the Commissioners' letter. I just refer to the fact that the report was lowered in the last two years of Mr. Elliott's principalship by Mr. Fenton and Mr. Dewar. It was brought to "fair" by Mr. Fenton in 1908, and kept at "fair" by Mr. Dewar. I have never yet been able to find out what function Mr.

[2nd July, 1918.]

Mr. THOMAS JAMIESON, B.A., CHAIRMAN.

[Continued.]

Dewar discharged in the school that day. The letter further contained an unfounded innuendo against myself as well as the unjust reflection on my production. My previous reports did not bear out that statement. The school had now been inspected by a different inspector each year for three consecutive years. Mr. Dewar was directly concerned in this appeal, and, as already stated, spent a whole day in the school, and furnished a report to the Board which he evidently believed to be in connection with the appeal, on 26th December, 1916; yet I am astonished to find the following passage in his letter to the Board of 10th March, 1917, in connection with the Belfast deputation (he sent the letter after reception of the Belfast deputation):

17012. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—That was his letter to the Board of the 10th of March, 1917, in reply to the statements of the Belfast deputation?—Yes. He said—"As few, if any, appeals were made for a re-inspection, I can only conclude that no teacher considered his school worthy of a higher mark than had been awarded." What reliance can be placed on the word of Mr. Dewar, who could make a statement of that sort to his official superiors three months after reporting, or thinking he was reporting, on an appeal? The inspection of 1911 was held by Mr. McMillan, inspector of Circuit 8 B, who is universally regarded as the most severe inspector in Ireland. The report, of course, was once more "fair," and though I felt that the school was again most unjustly marked, I realised that it would be futile to appeal again for justice to the Education Office. For four years in succession the inspector of Section A, the official in immediate charge of the school, was thus excluded from holding the annual inspection.

17013. The CHAIRMAN.—Who was that inspector?—For the first two years it was Mr. O'Connell and for the last two Mr. Homan.

17014. And they were excluded from what you considered their proper duty?—That is what I considered.

17015. Mr. KERRIN.—Your inspector is not Mr. McMillan?—No, sir.

17016. He was brought in?—He was brought in from the adjoining section. My inspector was excluded for four years.

17017. Mr. HANNA.—Were those inspectors on special work, or is there any way in which you can account for a new inspector being brought in?—I can only believe that Mr. Dewar sent them for the purpose of keeping down the report. My manager, Dr. Gibson, in a letter* to the Under-Secretary, Dublin Castle (enclosing my reply to the first report of the Board's Accountant on my case as an undergraded teacher), asked for an explanation of the suspension of the local inspector for such a lengthened period and of the sending of men with such unfavourable records to write reports on the school. No information on this question has yet been forthcoming to me, but in a further report on the case, dated 2nd September, 1912, the Accountant states—"I observe in Mr. Jamieson's remarks and the manager's grave statements are made impugning the justice of the inspectors' reports. This phase of the case is receiving the attention of the chief inspectors and of the Commissioners."

17018. What construction did you put on that?—I thought the chief inspectors and the Commissioners were inquiring into it in some way, and that we would get a reply to the statements which we had made.

17019. Mr. COOPER.—Did you, as a matter of fact, get a reply?—No, sir, I did not. On 7th February, 1915, I applied to the Under-Secretary for a copy of the chief inspectors' reply to the "grave statements" referred to, and the Commissioners' observations thereon, but my request has not yet been acceded to. In the absence, therefore, of any official reply to those statements made twelve months ago, I believe I am justified in suggesting to the Committee that Mr. Dewar deliberately excluded the section inspector from participation in the inspection of the school, and called to his assistance Messrs. Fulton, Cole and McMillan, in order to have the report marked down. I do not suggest, however, that he gave explicit instructions to Messrs. Cole and McMillan to maintain

the low mark, as he has stated he advised Mr. Fulton to lower marks generally; but I do contend that he selected them to inspect the school, because he knew they would not raise the mark; they were simply unconscious instruments in his hands. If I am wrong in my conclusions, it is certainly a remarkable fact that since Mr. Dewar's disappearance the school has been inspected in the ordinary way, like the other schools in the district, by its own inspector, and the next mark has been raised to "good." And if my insinuations be correct, then surely Mr. Dewar must have considered that the school was being maintained in a highly efficient condition when he found it necessary to take such extraordinary measures in order to secure low reports. Querulous and unrefined for notes were made in reports and in the Observation Book and registers by Messrs. Dewar and Cole. I will just give one or two instances. I have the books here. The Committee are aware that promotions are made on the 1st of July.

17020. Mr. HANNA.—That is, promotion of pupils?—Yes, from class to class. We promote children from the infants' school and transfer them to the senior school, sometimes a day or two before the end of the school year. We had done this in the year 1908, and for that day or two we had not entered the attendances in the register, and Mr. Dewar made a noting in the Observation Book that we had made some omissions in the register, and perhaps he was justified in that. However, when I saw the note I made all the entries that he objected to being left out, and when Mr. Cole came next year he left notes in the register which seemed to imply that those entries had not been made. This was putting in the attendances in the proper column, two days or one day, as the case may be, and then in the next column there is a heading, "Standard in which examined." Well, all the children were examined in the infants' school. They were examined in the first standard immediately preceding their promotion, and I filled in the column "In second standard not examined" in both the boys' register and the girls' register; and in the girls' register Mr. Cole left a note, "Why not examined?" and in the boys' register, evidently considering that this was the column for attendances, whereas it was the column for the standard, he wrote, "Give attendances," leaving the intimation that I had neglected my duty there again. And further, there was a note that has been referred to here by some of the witnesses, a note left by Mr. Dewar, that a wash-hand basin should be provided, although there was a fully equipped lavatory in the school that he had not seen.

17021. The CHAIRMAN.—Are those the strongest specimens?—I think those are the strongest.

17022. Mr. COOPER.—The Committee, of course, will understand that by the register you do not mean the roll book where the attendances of children are given?—Yes, the register, not the roll book.

17023. The CHAIRMAN.—Now you have something to say about promotion and cancellation of promotion in 1900?—Yes. In 1900 the Commissioners graded all teachers then in their service, according to their incomes from the Board at that time, irrespective of classification, qualifications, efficiency, or length of service. This action of the Commissioners was most unjust to highly classed assistants, and to many highly classed principals of small schools, who were depressed from the higher ranks under the old system to the lower grades under the new, and informed that they would have to climb the ladder of promotion a second time. Those teachers are now known as the "undergraded," and the Commissioners refuse to acknowledge the injustice that has been inflicted on them by the abolition of their classification.

17024. Have you any idea of their numbers in your own district?—I do not know the numbers in my district, but taking all Ireland I can give a rough idea. Mr. Birrell was questioned by Mr. Hackett in the House of Commons some years ago, and said he believed, roughly, the numbers were over 3,000 principals and 1,600 assistants.

17025. Have any steps been taken to remedy any of their grievances?—Not so far as I know. In July, 1915, Mr. Birrell, replying to Mr. Hackett, M.P., in the House of Commons, stated that the Commissioners had informed him that the undergraded teachers were

* Vide Appendix LL.

not in a worse position in status of emoluments than they would have been had the old system continued. A number of test cases, of which mine was one, were submitted to Mr. Birrell by the Central Executive Committee of the Irish National Teachers' Organisation, with the object of proving that some of these teachers at least had suffered financial loss under the grading system. According to the Board's rules up to 1906, highly classed assistants on appointment to principalship received their class salaries and other emoluments of principal teachers. I claimed that I was entitled to the equivalent of the total of these same on my appointment as a principal teacher, and that, therefore, my income should be £40 or £50 per annum greater than it is at present.

17966. Your present income being £330?—Yes.

17967. And you claim that it should be so much?—£160 or £170. The Board's Accountant, who examined the test cases, reported that since my appointment as principal teacher my total income from the Board has been less by £9 12s. per annum than it would have been had the results system continued. This dispositive statement supplied to Mr. Birrell for submission to the House of Commons. Now, though the Board's rule of 1887 (the year in which I was promoted to first class) expressly provided that I would receive my class salary and other special emoluments of a principal teacher on my appointment to that position, and though guarantees were given in 1900 that no teacher would lose to the extent of one penny by the operation of the new system, yet the Commissioners have up to the present withheld payment of even the small amount of the deficit admitted by their own Accountant, I have got no money yet.

17968. You will put in the Accountant's letter?—Yes; the date on which it was sent to me was 12th May, 1912. The Commissioners have recently established a new higher certificate for teachers, the award of which, it appears, is to depend on scholarship and efficient service. High classification under the former system was obtained on similar conditions, yet the Commissioners have deprived the undergraded teachers of the advantages of their classification. What stability is there in an administration which gives a teacher a standing, then deprives him of it, and thirteen years later tells him he has to traverse similar ground again in order to obtain another qualification, no better than that which has been taken from him.

17969. Mr. COFFEY.—Will you read the letter of the Accountant?—Yes. I claimed that I should have £30 or £40 more, and I wrote that down for the deposition of teachers to Mr. Birrell, in August, 1911, and this report comes to me in May, 1912.

17970. Is this the general case or your own?—It is my own particular case. The Accountant says:—"In approaching Mr. Jamison's case some preliminary considerations presented themselves. He was never a principal teacher under the old system; he was an assistant. He had a high class, which is the basis of his submitted grievance, but he never had the salary of that class under the old system, and it must be understood that he now claims that he should have the higher salary of the grade which ordinarily corresponds to the class, of which he never actually had the salary. When carrying through the great change of system in 1903 the Commissioners had in the first place to secure for the existing teachers an income not less than what they were actually having, and then to save their prospects to the utmost extent which the stipulation exacted from them of not increasing the vote would permit. Mr. Jamison was then in the capacity of assistant, and not only was he shielded from loss in that capacity, but his pay was improved. As he writes himself, 'my position as assistant was certainly improved.' " (Well, of course, that is so, my position as assistant was improved.) "When subsequently he advanced under the new regime to another capacity, that of principal, while it was most desirable, and incumbent so far as practicable to provide the fair equivalent of his previously contingent prospects now coming into possession, it must still be recognised that what was then in question were contingent prospects in a new

capacity less stragglingly vested, if circumstances obliged the Commissioners to make the distinction, then in his actually vested interest in the capacity in which the change found him. If this were to mean that the remuneration was to be so much less, as he represents than what it would have been, and that he was to be left in the predicament without active measures on the part of the Commissioners to remedy his case, it should be regarded as deplorable. But it will be seen that the difference in pay for life now capacity between the old and the new system is much less than it appears to him to be, and as he set it forth, also that the Commissioners have been untiring in their efforts for the last five years to move the Government and the Treasury to award such an increase of emolument for teachers such as he as would unquestionably and abundantly enhance his salary beyond the measure of that which would have been the payment under the old system for his new office." (If the old system had continued I would very likely have been admitted to first of first class, and had an additional £30.) "Another preliminary consideration has to be adverted to. This school is situated in what was under the old system a contributory poor law union; the guardians voluntarily assessing a tax to supplement the teachers' pay. No unions are contributory now, and under the old system it was only a small minority who taxed themselves for this purpose, and of this minority not all were constant. The teacher in a contributory union had more pay than his colleagues on the other side of the local boundary. Great and reasonable was the outcry under the old system against the inequality as well as the uncertainty of that element of the teachers' pay, to say nothing of the inappropriateness of the poor law system as an agency in educational administration. In the nature of things it became necessary under the new system that a uniform system of payment should prevail, and as the Commissioners were restricted in their power of increasing the vote, and as no more local money was to come from the guardians, it was inevitable that new teachers appointed in what were contributory unions, or continuing teachers in those localities when appointed to new grades or capacities of service, should find the new scale somewhat less than what they would have been receiving had the old conditions remained, and the diminution, it must be remembered, ensues from a cause totally independent of the question of the relations between claim and grade. I greatly regret in this case to have to refer to the nature of the reports, but it is necessary to do so, as it affects the financial issue. Inspectors' opinion of teachers as a result of their observation of the school and of the individual is generally expressed by assigning one of the following estimates:—"Excellent," "very good," "good," "fair," "middling," "bad." Mr. Jamison's record since 1906 has been as assistant, "fairly satisfactory," "fairly satisfactory," "fairly good," "good," "good," "good," "good," "fair, barely"; then as principal, "fair," "fair." These marks would not have qualified for admission to examination for first of first class, which required three consecutive years of highly efficient service, and even waiting this preliminary and presumptive bar in his case, success was not matter of course for these admitted. On an average taken over the last ten years of the old system, there were not quite one-half the number of promotions to the number of examinations of men aspiring to first of first class. I must therefore demur to Mr. Jamison's statement, "I would also probably have one promotion to first division of first class, entitling me to £21 additional had the old system continued." It is true, promotion might have been won under that system without examination, but for this there would have been required at least seven consecutive years of highly efficient service, and none of the reports testified to this. His estimate for results' fees, £60, I consider excessive. His mark as a teacher since his appointment as principal has been less than "good," and the mark for the school has been only similar. As the average rate of results' fees earning generally was about 9s. per unit of average attendance, I consider that in the circumstances it is no unfair estimate to attribute a results' coefficient of 10s. per unit to his school; that is, 16s., including rates. This yields £42 for his share. Again, as

22nd July, 1913.]

Mr. THOMAS JAMISON, B.A., examined.

[Continued.]

regards the residual capitulation grant, the remark applies, as explained in Miss McNeill's case, that it is a mistake to assume, as both have done, that the rule would not have fallen below so, and that to a considerable extent. But a more fatal consideration arises in Mr. Jamison's case. This residual capitulation grant was an encumbrance, the distribution of which among the staff of the school was originally left to the discretion of the managers, who mostly, but by no means universally, allowed it to be taken wholly by the principal teacher. The Commissioners came to consider that this was not right; that it should be shared in by the assistants. And so, in 1900, after first saving the vested interests of every principal who had been receiving the advantage by including in his then consolidated salary the full equivalent of what he had been getting, they ordained otherwise as regards future principals to be appointed. It was decided they should take a share only, a preferential share no doubt, but still a share only. The assistants were to participate according to the scale and conditions laid down, Rule 116 (b). The Commissioners found means also to secure this advantage or redress for the assistants, even in those cases where the old-time principal teacher was continuing to have the equivalent of a total residual in his new salary. Mr. Jamison was then an assistant, remaining as such up to 1900, when he came for the first time to be appointed a principal teacher, with no vested right to the totality of this grant, and I submit that it is surely no grievance for him now, nor constituting part of a grievance, that he receives only a share (a preferential share) of this grant, in which his assistants have to participate. Further, even if it were a grievance, it would have to be recognized that it was one which in no way rested upon his quality of undergraded teacher. It would appertain to him as a new-time principal, in contrast with those other individuals who had been continuing in that capacity from the old epoch. If, instead of being undergraded, he were fully graded or over graded, this particular grievance, such as it is, would still appertain to him: it would have no existence for him if he had been an old-time principal whether he were undergraded, fully graded, or over graded. I, therefore, submit that this element of residual grant distribution is altogether foreign to an examination of the case of the undergraded teachers."

17071. Who signs that?—Mr. Naisb. "Excluding as it seems right to me to do for the reasons stated, both the Brevell and the residual grants, the comparison will stand thus:—Old system—Class salary, 50 per cent., £46 12s. 6d.; results and rates, £63—total, £109 12s. 6d. New system—Grade salary, £96. This shows a disadvantage of the new system in Mr. Jamison's present salary of nearly £10, and that, of course, would be a substantial disadvantage if it were not that the £96 is a growing salary under the new system. His next increment will be £10, thus annulling the disadvantage mentioned. But the growth will not stop there. Further increases, bringing the £106 up to £175, are provided in the new scale. The standard numbers present a difficulty, but the commissioners are not likely to relax their effort to remove that bar. They will also most probably renew their recommendations for bonuses for principals of large schools, which, if granted, will bring in another £20 a year to Mr. Jamison, subject to efficiency; and for all these reasons I consider that this case would certainly not be a strong one to exemplify loss under the new system. Mr. Jamison instances the Pensioners Office procedure upon the occasion of the change as being just or favourable, and implies a contrast with the Commissioners' action, and this contrast is, I submit, founded upon a fallacy, which presumably deceives Mr. Jamison himself and might easily mislead others. That department had necessarily to arrange for the substitution of the term 'grade' for 'class' in their rules generally, but foreseeing that teachers like Mr. Jamison would then be disqualified for so high a pension as they were previously entitled to subscribe for, the department provided that teachers such as he should be treated for pension purposes as of a higher grade, in order that they might remain entitled to pension rights as high as, not higher than,

they had. In essential similarity, the Commissioners provided Mr. Jamison with as good a salary as he had, and they have also saved his prospects. If, indeed, Mr. Jamison could show either that the Pensioners Department had provided larger pension rights while the Commissioners have assigned only the fair equivalent of the old salary, or that while the Commissioners depressed him in salary the Pensioners Department have preserved for him the pension rights which he had, his point would be made. But until he demonstrates either of these things, which I apprehend it will be impossible to do, he must, I submit, fail to establish that there is any essential disparity in the procedure of the two departments, to his disadvantage as regards salary. It might, perhaps, be not so easy to reject the opposite suggestion if it were advanced—that while the pensioners scale remains the same the new salary scales and arrangements provide for higher increments.

17072. Mr. Henson—You were promoted to the first division of third class after one year's efficient service?—Yes.

17073. That was in the shortest time that it could be obtained under the then rules?—That is so.

17074. Then you were admitted to the examination for second class in 1894. Now, admission to that examination implies that the inspector must have been satisfied with your work as a teacher?—That is so.

17075. And then, in order to get promotion, you had to pass the examination?—That is so.

17076. Then, to get to the highest division of the second class it required efficient work in the school?—That is so.

17077. And you got that at the end of one year?—That is so.

17078. The shortest time in which that step could have been obtained?—That is so.

17079. You were then admitted to Marlborough Street Training College in 1896 for one year's course of training, and at the end of the course of training you were promoted to the second division of first class?—That is so.

17080. Then, in 1900, you got the diploma after two years?—Yes, sir.

17081. Again, the shortest time in which that diploma could be granted according to the rules of the Board?—Yes, that is so.

17082. And, therefore, your record as a teacher up to 1900 in that you got the several steps of promotion as quickly as would be possible to obtain them?—That is so.

17083. So, in other words, you must have thoroughly satisfied the inspectors under whom you were then working?—I believe so.

17084. You were awarded increment after three years' service in 1903?—Yes.

17085. Again as quickly as you could get it?—Yes.

17086. And another increment in 1906, is not that so?—Yes, the shortest time again.

17087. And, therefore, the whole of your career from 1898 to 1906 consisted of steps in promotion on which the award of increment was given in the minimum time?—That is so.

17088. In 1900 you were appointed principal, is not that so?—That is so.

17089. Now, when the grading system was introduced in 1900 you were in the second division of the first class?—That is so.

17090. Now, supposing that that system had continued, in what time might you have reached the top of the profession, that is, the first division of first class?—Well, I believe I could have reached it in three years.

17091. According to the rules, what is the minimum time?—Three years, I think, from the date of being put in second division of first.

17092. What is the minimum time in which you could obtain it by highly efficient service?—Seven years' highly efficient service or three years and examination.

17093. I may assume that as you obtained the degree of B.A. you would have been able to pass the examination?—I believe I would.

17904. Now, supposing that the old system had remained in force and that you were promoted, as you could have been, at the end of three years to the first division of first class, what would have been your standing when you were made principal in 1909; what would have been your emoluments?—I would have had £84 class salary, and I still maintain about £90 of results' fees.

17905. Take it even at what the Accountant assumes, £41—£42.

17906. That would be £84 and £42?—Yes, that would be £126; and then the capitation grant and the Burrell grant.

17907. How much would they be?—The Burrell grant would be £30, and the capitation grant, I suppose would have been the same as the present capitation grant—between 50 and 70. If I had an average of 140 I would be paid on 70.

17908. How much does it come to?—It would be about £177.

17909. How much does that make altogether?—£84, £42, £17 and £10. That makes £153.

18000. And now, what are you actually getting?—About £120.

18001. So that you have a net loss of over £30?—Over £30 per annum.

18002. £30, in fact?—Yes.

18003. But there is worse than that to my mind, Mr. Jamison. What grade are you at present?—Second grade.

18004. That is down amongst the mediocrities?—There are some very good people in second grade, but they are counted mediocrities, perhaps.

18005. Instead of being in the position of first of first?—That is so.

18006. And how long would it take you under the most favourable conditions to get from your present position away up to the top?—It would take me, I am sure, to the end of my service, and it is questionable whether I would have it even then.

18007. But I say under the most favourable conditions?—I do not believe I could do it till I had reached 65.

18008. You do not think it is possible to attain the rank that was then within your reach in three years; that your whole period of service would be spent in getting to the maximum salary?—Do you mean in getting £133?

18009. I mean to get to the top rank; the first division of first grade?—Well, it would take over 20 years; it would take 20 or 25 years.

18010. So that by the introduction of the grading system you have not only lost substantially financially, but your status as a teacher has been lowered. First, you were put down to third grade?—Yes; third grade at first, and afterwards into second.

18011. Now, when they promoted you from being assistant to the principal, what increase of salary did they give you?—£11. That was at the end of almost two years, and after that appeal that I have been talking about was decided.

18012. Now their own Rule 119 (c) says that, "Assistants on promotion to principals receive as a rule an initial salary equal to their salary as assistants, but if highly classed under the old rules, or if appointed to a large and important school, they receive special consideration."—Yes.

18013. So that the only special consideration that was extended to you was to increase your salary by £11?—That is so.

18014. Was that an equivalent for the increased duty and responsibility of being principal of a large and important school?—I do not consider that it was.

18015. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—You understand, Mr. Jamison, that we are not here for the purpose of hearing and obtaining redress for individual complaints?—I am aware of that, sir.

18016. And it is, therefore, necessary that we should understand whether your case is a typical case or an isolated case, and I should like to know exactly from you whether the case you have just described is a typical case?—Well, I would not like to say that it is a typical case as regards inspection; I do not know of any other exactly similar.

18017. Mr. HENRY.—I think you practically answer that question when you say you belong to the under-graded, and that there are about 3,500 of them?—Yes, as an undergraded teacher; but I mean as far as inspectors' reports are concerned.

18018. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—I am speaking of the financial loss and the loss in grade. Are those losses shared generally by undergraded teachers?—I do not think there are many losing such an amount, and there are some I know who are losing nothing; who will tell you that they are losing nothing, but they feel the loss of status very much.

18019. And the loss of status is a general grievance?—Yes, it is.

18020. And the loss of money is felt by some?—Yes.

18021. Some have lost?—Yes.

18022. So that, whether in amount or not, your case does represent other cases which have occurred in which undergraded teachers have lost by the change?—That is so.

18023. The BRIDGE OF ROSS.—I think there is very little doubt that, contingently, you lost by the new system in 1900?—That is so, my lord.

18024. I presume there were some advantages, were there not, in the system of 1900, some financial advantages (I am not speaking of you personally as an assistant)?—Yes, to some teachers, undoubtedly there were some advantages. The position of assistants generally, I believe, was improved under the new system. My position as assistant was, I admit, improved financially; though at the same time I was placed in the lowest grade, yet I got more money as an assistant.

18025. The whole body of assistants at present, taking them as a body, are financially better off than the body of assistants were before the change of 1900?—Perhaps the majority are; but in some schools I believe there are assistants who are receiving less—at least assistants appointed since 1900, who are receiving less than they would have under the old system.

18026. Is it correct that a large number of teachers of small schools, principal teachers, are better off now than they were before 1900?—I cannot speak with authority on that point, but I have heard statements to that effect.

18027. Here is a large fact. The total amount of money distributed to the teachers from the National Board prior to 1900 was only about £800,000, and the total amount of money now spent amongst the teachers from the National Board is over a million and a half. The amount of money that went to the teachers prior to 1900 was between £800,000 and £900,000 per annum, and now it is £1,500,000?—That is so.

18028. And, therefore, if some have suffered a great many must have benefited?—That is so, my lord.

18029. That money has gone to them, and it seems to me that the body of the teachers, specially the assistants and the principals in small schools, are much better off than they had been?—That may be; of course, the Commissioners themselves admit that the principals of large schools have suffered by the change, and they are waiting the Treasury to give them more money for that, and they cannot get it.

18030. It appears to me that the few have suffered and the many have benefited?—That is so; but I am one of the few, unfortunately, my lord.

The BRIDGE OF ROSS.—I quite sympathise with you.

18031. Mr. HENRY.—And I suppose you do not abandon all hope of getting redress in your case?—Certainly not.

18032. The BRIDGE OF ROSS.—Year after year the amount of money, on the whole, for the remuneration of teachers is going up?—Yes.

18033. Because, the body are getting promoted gradually, so that year after year the amount of money spent is greater and greater?—That is so, my lord. But, of course, you must bear in mind that promotions are practically stopped in the higher grades now on account of the limitation of the standard numbers.

18034. The BRIDGE OF ROSS.—And if the aristocracy of the service have suffered, the rank and file of the service are picking up what the aristocracy have lost.

22nd July, 1915.]

Mr. THOMAS JAMISON, B.A., examined.

[Continued.]

18035. Mr. KEITH.—Do you feel very much like an aristocrat on £120 a year?—I do not.

18036. The Bishop of Ross.—Mr. Jamison's complaint is that he has been excluded from the aristocracy?—That is so.

18037. You ought to be amongst them, but you have been excluded by the change?—Quite so.

18038. Mr. KEITH.—In looking through your Observation Book I notice, with regard to the entry asking for a wash-hand basin, that there is a specific entry to this effect:—"The lavatory accommodation is totally inadequate; one wash-hand basin and towel available for all the teachers of the senior and infants' schools, and there seems no accommodation at all for the pupils."—Well, Mr. Dewar recommended one wash-hand basin for the whole school, and Mr. Hogan reports that the supply of one lavatory is not enough; and the teachers, I must say, have something else to do in our schools than go and wash their hands in the lavatory. The lavatory is open to the children to go into if they like.

18039. He says there seems to be no suitable accommodation for the pupils?—Well, the children go into the lavatory.

18040. So that entry is not apparently true?—I do not like it; and besides, I insist on the children coming to school with clean hands and faces in the morning, and they have something to do other than wash their hands and faces when they come to me.

18041. I must say that a more disgraceful example of inspectors' penmanship I cannot imagine, and with regard to the system of inspection I notice here two inspectors of the male persuasion, one of whom makes comments with regard to the fashion in which girls tie their hair, and another says, "Blemishing was indifferent. Sewing was better. Girls should not sew without their thumbs." Do these columns in the inspection book mean anything—these entries here of "Proficiency of classes" and "State number examined," and there is no entry whatever of the number examined?—Under the present system they do not, as a rule, examine all the pupils. They ask them a few questions here and there.

18042. So that when the new system came in they did not bring in new books?—No, they did not.

18043. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Those papers that you put in include a paper* on the undergraded teachers of the 26th of August, 1911, and a case sent to the Under-Secretary, Dublin Castle, that was sent by Dr. Gibson?—Yes.

18044. And then there is a report of Mr. Keith saying that instruction is hampered by congestion?—That is the first report I got from Mr. Keith. I put it in to compare with another report on Mr. Todd's school that was marked "good."

18045. "The work of instruction is hampered by congestion. The teachers are earnest, and make preparation. Junior writing and senior singing are decidedly good in quality, but grammar and geography in fifth and sixth standards, while arithmetic generally is but 'fair.' Reading would improve if the teachers of the lower standards insisted on the children imitating patterns distinctly and impressively read for them. Stricter discipline should be maintained, and the children should not be allowed to adopt lazy attitudes at desk exercises. There is a good supply of desks, but the seats of those in one room are too far from the desks." Whose report is that?—Mr. Keith's, in 1911. Mr. Keith had just

come to the district, and that is his first report on my school, and at the succeeding inspection he raised the mark.

18046. There is another report here without a signature?—That is Mr. Dewar's report on Mr. Todd's school.

18047. The inspector remarks—"The school is much overcrowded, the class-rooms are uncomfortable and badly ventilated, and the desk accommodation is so limited that the infant pupils receive scarcely any instruction or lessons in them. Under such circumstances high class work cannot be done. Arithmetic is only fair, and oral composition has not received sufficient practice. More attention should be given to the posture of the pupils at writing lessons. Reading has been carefully taught. The singing of the classes was satisfactory, while the order and discipline were very commendable."—That is Mr. Dewar's report on Mr. Todd's school in 1908.

18048. You give this to show that under the same conditions Mr. Todd's school got "good" and yours got "fair," and Mr. Keith was a stranger to the district?—He was only three weeks there, and at a subsequent inspection, when he had time to know the school and the teachers, he raised the report with the consent of his senior, Mr. Kelly, to "good."

18049. You have here the resolution of the Tipperary Association of March, 1910—"That believing that Mr. Cole, junior inspector, has not treated the teachers of this district with courtesy and justice, we respectfully request the Commissioners to hold an inquiry into the inspection work he has made in the district?"—Yes.

18050. And there is the resolution of the West Clare Association of April, 1910—"We beg to bring under the notice of the Commissioners that grave dissatisfaction exists in our district at the conduct of a young junior inspector, Mr. Cole, who was recently doing temporary duty here, and who in almost every instance reduced in the school inspected by him the reports of previous senior and district inspectors, educational experts of the highest reputation."—Yes.

18051. The CHAIRMAN.—And that is your justification of your severe opinion of Mr. Cole when he came to your district?—Yes; with these two resolutions against him, I think he should not have been sent to Belfast or to me.

18052. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—You are aware that these resolutions were passed?—Yes, I have them here in the Irish School Weekly. I have the copies of the Weekly here in which they are published.

18053. The next is the case of the undergraded teachers?—Yes, that is my rejoinder to the report that I have read, and Dr. Gibson sent that to the Under-Secretary together with that letter of his own. Dr. Gibson sent both.

18054. Mr. KEITH.—Did you ever think of taking a test case in the courts of law against the Commissioners with regard to the way in which they adjusted the salaries?—Well, I have thought of it, but I do not know whether I would be justified in going to law over it. I would only do so as a last resource.

18055. Mr. COOPER.—In connection with this increase from £900,000 to £1,500,000, that, I take it, does not arise from the changes in the system, but this increase would have come in any case from the pressure of your Parliamentary friends and your organisation?—I believe it would.

National School, County Down, examined.

18061. Did you come into second grade in 1900, when the new system was introduced?—Yes, sir.

18062. Have you risen from that since?—No.

18063. You are still second grade?—Still second grade.

18064. You were first principal of Tullycarrig School?—Yes, from 1890 to 1911; and I was principal of another school before that—Derraghrey, Beragh, County Tyrone.

18065. That was before 1890?—Yes.

18066. Had you any school before that?—No, sir; that was my first appointment.

* Vide Appendix LI.

Mr. WILLIAM AMMONSON, Principal of Dunover 18056. The CHAIRMAN.—You are the principal of the amalgamated school of Dunover?—I am, sir.

18057. Where is that?—In the County Down; Ballywalter, in the County Down, is the port town.

18058. You are a first class trained teacher under the National Board?—Yes, sir.

18059. How long have you been in the first class?—Since 1890.

18060. What was your grading under the new system?—My grading under the new system was second grade.

18067. Then you became principal of Tollymore in 1890, and in 1911 three schools were amalgamated—Tollymore, Ballyashin and Ballyferret?—Yes.

18068. What size was Tollymore before it was amalgamated with the other two?—An average of about 38.

18069. And since the amalgamation took place what does the average of the combined school come to?—Well, it runs from 68 to 71; 69 was the lowest.

18070. So the other two must have been very small schools?—They were small schools; very small.

18071. And now you are the principal of the amalgamated schools?—Yes.

18072. And you have given us the reports you have received from 1902 to 1912?—Yes.

18073. And these show that you had for several years "very good" down to 1901, when you fell to "good"?—Yes.

18074. And in 1902 "good." It follows, therefore, that it was in the year of the amalgamation that your merit mark was reduced?—Yes.

18075. Reduced to "good" by Mr. Hosan?—Yes, sir.

18076. You were ineligible for promotion owing to the average numbers in your first school, Tollymore?—Yes, sir.

18077. You could not rise any higher?—Could not rise any higher.

18078. In your present school you are eligible for promotion?—Yes.

18079. And have been from the beginning?—And have been from the beginning.

18080. But the reports that you are getting make that impossible?—Yes; I had two "very goods" and one "good," but the last was "good," and therefore it barred me.

18081. I see here that in 1909 you had "very good," in 1910 no inspection, in 1911 "good," and 1912 "good." That would not give you promotion?—No; but I was entitled to promotion on entering into the new school.

18082. Were you?—Yes; because I had earned special promotion, according to Dr. Blackie, in 1909, but could not get it for lack of average; but he said that as soon as I would get the average, if my reports continued as they were, I was entitled to promotion.

18083. That the reports down to 1909 would have given you special promotion if you had the average numbers?—Yes.

18084. Mr. CROFT.—Was that statement in writing?—Well, I have it in writing.

18085. The CHAIRMAN.—Now I come to this, that the report of 1911 was based on the result of an inspection held on the 20th of January, exactly two months before the amalgamation took place?—Yes, sir.

18086. That was on the old school of Tollymore?—That was on the old school of Tollymore.

18087. Well, on that old school therefore your merit mark was reduced?—On that old school my merit mark was reduced, and you see that was immediately before I entered the larger school, when I would be inclined to put forth my best efforts.

18088. But still you were reduced in your old school?—Yes, sir.

18089. By Mr. Hosan?—By Mr. Hosan.

18090. That was his first inspection?—That was his first inspection.

18091. And is he still circuit inspector there?—Not since now. He is removed to another circuit in Belfast.

18092. He was removed soon after that inspection?—Yes.

18093. Your next inspection was by Mr. Kelly, the senior inspector?—Yes.

18094. In 1912?—Yes.

18095. Then you say you were looking forward to promotion as soon as the amalgamation would be effective, and that was on the ground of increased numbers?—On the ground of increased numbers.

18096. Your previous reports would have given you that promotion with the increased numbers?—Yes.

18097. And what prevented you from getting that promotion?—Mr. Hosan's report.

18098. Which lowered you to "good"?—Which lowered me to "good."

18099. And then the report in 1912 left you just in the same position?—Just left me in the same position.

18100. Now, you made an appeal against Mr. Hosan's report in 1911?—I did.

18101. Tell us the circumstances of that appeal?—Well, of course, I did not consider Mr. Hosan's report at all a fair one.

18102. You made your appeal through your manager?—I made my appeal through my managers; I had three of them then.

18103. Who were they?—George Allen, Esq., the Rev. George Heames, of Ballyvaughan, and the Rev. Samuel Lyons.

18104. And what was the result of the appeal?—What happened?—In May Mr. Dewar came.

18105. The inspection was in January?—Yes.

18106. When did your appeal go in?—Oh, immediately after I got the report back from Dublin.

18107. When did the report reach you?—Well, it is dated the 23rd of February, 1911, and it would be shortly after that that it would reach me.

18108. The 30th of January was the date of the examination?—The 30th of January was the date of the examination, and the report is dated the 23rd of February.

18109. About a month after?—Yes, about a month after.

18110. And your appeal went up on that date?—Well, immediately after this; say, two or three days.

18111. After the 3rd of February?—Yes; as soon as I could prepare it.

18112. And when did you get a reply?—I got no reply.

18113. You got no reply?—No; there came a letter to the manager stating that the matter would be referred to the inspector.

18114. That was all you ever heard of it?—That was all I ever heard about it till Mr. Dewar came into the school one morning and started examination.

18115. When was that?—That was in May.

18116. You heard nothing till Mr. Dewar came in to make an examination?—Nothing, only the communication to the manager.

18117. What did Mr. Dewar say then?—He did not say anything, but started to examine the amalgamated school.

18118. What, technically, was the nature of that examination?—It seemed to be a thorough examination.

18119. Mr. HENLY.—Examination or inspection, which?—Examination.

18120. The CHAIRMAN.—And was it your impression that he had been sent down as a result of your appeal to examine the school?—Well, that was my impression, although I asked him what the purpose of the examination, but I was not answered.

18121. He did not answer your question?—No; of course my private impression was, that that visit was the result of my appeal.

18122. Now, about the amalgamation. These two small schools amalgamated with your Tollymore school were, I suppose, rather inferior to yours, were they not?—Well, they were not getting as good reports.

18123. They were not as efficient?—Well, it is hardly fair for me to say that.

18124. What is your impression?—Well—

18125. Mr. CROFT.—Well, they were not getting as good reports?—They were not getting as good reports as I was getting.

18126. The CHAIRMAN.—The children were not of as good a quality as your children?—I do not think so.

18127. The BISHOP OF ROSKE.—It would be also desirable to state the numbers from your own school and the numbers from those other schools. You told us that those schools were smaller than yours. You said your own school was about 38. How large was each of the smaller schools?—Well, one would be considerably under 30, and the other would be, perhaps, a little over 30. One was over 30 and the other was under 20.

22nd July, 1913.]

Mr. WILLIAM ANDERSON examined.

[Continued.]

18128. The CHAIRMAN.—What happened to the teachers of the small schools?—The teacher of the smaller of the two schools went to America. The teachers of the other came into my school, and they are in it still.

18129. The BISHOP OF ROSE.—Did you bring with you all the children from your own school?—Practically.

18130. And those other children also came into the new amalgamated school?—Yes.

18131. There was a new central building erected?—Yes; a new central building erected.

18132. Mr. KERR.—What were the distances?—Well, strangely enough, each of the old schools was exactly a mile from the new school. We had a circle, and we built in the centre.

18133. The CHAIRMAN.—When you got your amalgamated school established in the first year the quality of the whole would not be as good as the quality of your original school at Tullycovey?—It would not, and it was not as good as it is now, because I think I will get "very good" this year. That is my impression.

18134. Just after your amalgamation the quality was not quite so good as it had been before?—Well, I would not say it was.

18135. Mr. HARRISON.—Did you suffer any loss in 1900 by the new system of grading?—I would not say that I did, because they gave me the same salary. I do not complain of that at all.

18136. Now, you say it is worthy of note that the report was first lowered as a result of inspection held on the 20th of January, 1911, exactly two months before the amalgamation. What is the inference you draw from that?—The inference I would draw from it is this—that inspectors were more severe when money was attached to the examination than when no money was attached to the examination; because I believe that my school was fully as well taught that year as ever it had been, and the children were quite as capable of making a good examination as ever they had been, and it was not likely that I would relax my efforts as a teacher on that crucial year when I was hoping for promotion.

18137. But I do not understand how you could have got promotion on that inspection when you had not got it before. You were in the same school?—I was in the same school, but I was going into a large school.

18138. But then, would the back reports have counted?—Yes, they should have.

18139. But you have told us just now that you understood from Dr. Starkie, and I think also that you said you had a letter from him saying that on those reports you would get your promotion to another grade as soon as the numbers allowed it?—Yes; there was nothing to prevent that.

18140. Have you got that letter?—No, I have not got it with me.

18141. Was it a letter from Dr. Starkie telling you that on those reports, we will say, ending in 1903, when you got three "very goods" running—that on those you could claim your promotion to the first grade as soon as the numbers would justify it?—According to the rules of the Board, I could claim it no matter whether Dr. Starkie said it or not.

18142. You told us you had a letter?—I told you I had a letter. It was not from Dr. Starkie, but it is a letter that I got from Mr. Dilworth. It was written to a clergyman who was well acquainted with Mr. Dilworth, and it was a private letter, and therefore I did not bring it.

18143. Sir HERAM WILKINSON.—I just want to get the exact words of that. Can you give us the exact words of what Mr. Dilworth said, or tell us as nearly as you can the exact words of what Mr. Dilworth said in his letter?—Yes.

18144. Well, just tell us?—He said that Mr. William Anderson by his reports had earned special promotion in 1909, but it could not be granted to him owing to lack of average; but that he hoped, as soon as he would enter the new school, or the amalgamated school, his case would come up for consideration at

once. That is as near as I can remember the words of the letter.

18145. I thought you said something about "If the reports were as good"?—No.

18146. Mr. HARRISON.—I understood that those "very goods" would have a retrospective value as soon as your average had reached the limit?—So they would, provided this report of Mr. Honan had not come in to bar that.

18147. But then it is not retrospective. I understood that in 1909 you had established your claim to promotion as soon as the numbers went up?—Yes.

Mr. HARRISON.—Then I want to know why you did not get it.

Mr. HENRY.—In Mr. Dilworth's evidence in reference to special promotion, he says that for schools between 50 and 70 six consecutive "very good" reports and at least 15 years' service are required.

Mr. HARRISON.—Here are those six "very good" reports, and I want to know why he did not get into the first grade.

Mr. HENRY.—Because he had not the average.

18148. Mr. HARRISON.—I understood that these would become operative as soon as the average went up. Then why did you not get the promotion?—Because that "good" blotted out all my previous good service up to that.

18149. Mr. KERR.—That was the effect of the "good" at the end?—The "good" at the end blotted out all my previous good reports.

18150. Mr. HARRISON.—I thought from the quotation of the letter of 1909 that you had established your claim to promotion perfectly irrespective of any subsequent report, directly you got the requisite average?—I would have no complaint if that had been the effect; but that "good" blotted out all my previous good service.

18151. Mr. KERR.—You were not acquainted with the rule governing special promotion until the proceedings of this Committee were published?—No, I knew nothing about it.

18152. Mr. HARRISON.—And you applied?—Yes; I applied to Dr. Starkie for promotion after getting the average in the new school, and here is Dr. Starkie's reply to that:—"Dear Sir:—In reply to your letter of the 18th inst., I am instructed by the Resident Commissioner to state that he has considered your application very carefully, and regrets that it is not possible to sanction your promotion to the first grade in the present year. Your claim will, however, be considered next year should you receive a "very good" report at the next inspection. The enclosures which you sent are returned herewith. I am, dear sir, yours faithfully—A. N. Bonaparte Wyse. To Mr. William Anderson." Now you see that that "good" report blotted out my previous record.

18153. Yes; that was not quite clear. Now, perhaps, you will read to us that report which had as disastrous an effect—Mr. Honan's report of 1911?—Yes, this is the original report.

18154. Mr. KERR.—This is the minute supplied to you?—Yes, Mr. Honan's report.

18155. Mr. HARRISON.—Will you read it?—Yes; but may I comment on it as I go along?

18156. You had better read it first?—Then I hope you will let me comment on it afterwards:—"More thought and intelligence are needed in the methods of conducting the school. Defects exist in the division of work, in the grouping of the standards, and in the methods of instruction. The work in the senior division especially consists too much in superintending and in the hearing of lessons. There is too little instruction of a connected nature affecting the mental development of the pupils. Reading lacks clearness in enunciation, and there is no effect at expression, whilst oral answering is very defective. The pupils' knowledge of arithmetic and geography is very mechanical; but penmanship and drawing are, on the whole, "very good," and singing, sewing and drill are efficiently taught. In general, an effort is needed to conduct the school on lines more consonant to the wishes and suggestions of the Commissioners. The division of the work between the principal and the junior assistant mistress is very uneven. The prin-

dipal teaches 17 pupils on the rolls, and the junior assistant mistress 32 on the rolls. The time-table is not duly observed. At two separate times the work was differently arranged to time-table arrangements, and the grouping of the classes was at times very injudicious. There are four pupils enrolled in seventh and eighth standards (the principal teacher's children), who work all day at the intermediate courses, but no arrangement for their employment appears on the time-table, though I recommended at last visit that such should appear. Again, the third standard was grouped with infants of the first and second for stick-laying, and infants of the first and second standards were taken in same draft for reading, infants getting no instruction. The proscribed course in geography is not taught to junior division. The second standard went to map of world (no teacher in charge), and third to map of Ireland (junior assistant mistress in charge), but none of these pupils could tell how to know east or south. The instruction in both divisions of the school in geography is most mechanical."

18157. Mr. CORRY.—Had he never inspected your previous school?—No, sir.

18158. But he speaks there of a previous visit?—That was in connection with the furnishing of the new school.

18159. Mr. HARRISON.—Have you got your Observation Book?—I have not.

18160. Do you happen to know what notes he put in the Observation Book at that particular visit?—I do, on that particular visit because it affected myself, and only myself.

18161. Was it a long note in the Observation Book?—No, it was not. My four children were working in the intermediate course, and no other children were reading that course at all only mine. They were taught French and Latin by a gentleman in the locality. I took them to his house in the evening, and their work during the day was regulated more or less by the amount of work this gentleman gave them in Latin and French; and the only attempt at keeping a time-table for these four children was this—that I scribbled one on a slip of paper and pinned it to the wall where they were working, and did not enter it on the time-table of the school.

18162. Had any of your previous reports, those of the last year and the year before, noticed any deficiencies in either reading or arithmetic?—Now, take the report of the previous year, I will read it.

18163. Can you not answer the question—what was said of reading and what was said of arithmetic, if anything?—Reading or arithmetic was not mentioned in either of the two previous years' reports.

18164. But you got "very good"—I got "very good."

18165. You wish now to make some comments on Mr. HOSMAN's reports?—Yes. The first paragraph in Mr. HOSMAN's report says that I have not taught the school with intelligence or success. Now, a strange thing about my previous report is that I think for the last seven or eight reports previous to that every inspector stated that I taught the school with intelligence and success. Now, here is a paragraph from the previous report, 1908. This is Mr. O'Connell's report:—"The teacher of this school is capable and hard-working, and he conducts the school with intelligence and success."

18166. In what year was that?—In 1908. I had no report in 1910. Well, then, in 1908—"The teacher of this school is energetic and efficient, and he discharges his duties with intelligence and success." Then, 1907—"This is a very well conducted school. The principal teacher is intelligent, energetic and efficient, and the progress of the pupils during the past year has been very satisfactory." Then, 1906—"The school is carefully conducted, and a high degree of proficiency has been reached." That is from Mr. DEWAR. Then Mr. CHAMBERS, in 1905, says—"As there are too many schools in the locality the attendance at this one continues small, although the pupils attend very regularly. Mr. Anderson is an energetic and conscientious teacher; he makes careful preparation of his work, and is very zealous in the discharge of his duty."

18167. Now, that is the comment on the remark as to lack of intelligence?—That is the comment on the remark as to lack of intelligence.

18168. Now, what is the next point?—Well, that is about the time-table not being observed on two separate occasions.

18169. Well, now about the time-table?—One of the occasions he refers to when he speaks of the time-table not being duly observed was when, as he says, the second class were at the map of the world. Now, the second class have no geography to learn whatever.

18170.1. Mr. CORRY.—It is not in their programme?—Yes, there is nothing in the programme, and my school, the old school, was a long, low building, with a ceiling 8 feet 6 inches high, and the maps had to hang on that wall, and, therefore, where there was a draft circle in front of a map one might imagine that the children were at the map, unless they went and ascertained that they were not, but that they were at something else. My second class on that occasion were not at the map of the world at all. They were standing round in a draft circle opposite the map of the world learning tables, and the third class were standing round the map of Ireland, and those two points you see can be borne out from this fact, that the third class have nothing to do with the map of Ireland whatever in the programme. The third class have nothing whatever to do with the map of Ireland in the programme; no part of the map of Ireland is laid down in their programme, and why should I send the children, especially when the inspector was sitting there, to the map of Ireland, when it was no part of their programme.

18172. Mr. HARRISON.—Your first answer was quite enough, when you simply told us that it was not in their programme?—Now, then, the next point?—If my memory serves me right there were two questions asked. There may have been more, and I would not say that these were not more questions, but I have only a remembrance of two, and one was "the easiest way for me to get to London," and "did you ever see water running up a hill."

18173. The CHAIRMAN.—Were these asked of the children that were standing opposite the map of the world or the map of Ireland?—I do not think so.

18174. Mr. HARRISON.—Did the inspector, as a matter of fact, put any questions on geography to those two forms that were standing in a semi-circle opposite those two maps?—No.

18175. He did not?—No.

18176. How did he arrive at the conclusion that they did not know how to tell east and south without asking them some questions?—I do not know.

18177. The CHAIRMAN.—He concluded they were learning geography because they were looking at the maps?—Because they were standing opposite.

18178. Mr. HARRISON.—And to whom did he put those questions that you have given us?—He put them to the fourth class.

18179. And then how did he arrive at the conclusion which he states in his report that the children could not tell how to know east or south?—I could not tell how Mr. HOSMAN arrived at that piece of information.

18180. You, at any rate, as far as you can remember, did not hear questions put to them?—I did not, as far as I remember.

18181. Are there any other points?—Just that about the division of work between the principal and the junior assistant mistress.

18182. What have you to say about that?—I had the fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh standards, and I taught all the drawing of the whole school, and the drill of the whole school, and the writing of the whole school, so that there was not that line of demarcation that Mr. HOSMAN points out between the work of the junior assistant mistress and my own, and I was responsible for the proficiency of the whole school, as everyone knows.

18183. Well, that he does not deny; but I gather from that report that in his opinion your assistant mistress had more than her share of the teaching, and is not that what one would naturally conclude from the report?—Yes, that is the impression that the report

22nd July, 1918.]

Mr. WILLIAM ANDERSON examined.

[Continued.]

would leave upon one's mind; but remember, I earned all the reports previous to that without the aid of a junior assistant mistress, and that was the first year I ever had the aid of anyone only myself.

18184. Had the numbers gone up?—No; excuse me, I had a workmistress up to that, but the workmistress resigned, and when she resigned then a junior assistant mistress was appointed.

18185. The junior assistant was qualified to take a certain share?—She was a fully qualified teacher, not qualified only as a junior assistant, but fully qualified as a teacher.

18186. Was she trained?—No, she was classified, and acted as assistant before she came to me.

18187. Does that conclude your comments on the report?—Well, I think it does. I could go into it more minutely, but I do not wish to.

18188. I think that has been full enough, has it not?—Yes.

18189. Are there any other points on which you wish to give us evidence, as you mentioned at the end of your report?—"I am now prepared to answer questions on the present inspection system generally," though I may say that we have had a very large amount of evidence upon that, but perhaps there may be some new light that you can throw on it.—Well, I have written out two or three notes on the thing.

18190. Perhaps you will give us the notes, but I do not need to put any questions. You may be able to tell us something that we had not before?—Very well, sir.

18191. Mr. CORRY.—What are your notes?—Well, I have a few here that I would like to put before you.

18192. Mr. HAZARD.—Will you give them to us?—I will be very glad if you have patience to hear me.

18193. The CHAIRMAN.—We want to hear what you have to say?—Well, I think it is not in the best interests of education in a circuit to move the inspectors so often.

18194. You have not had many changes. You had Mr. Chambers for three years and Mr. O'Connell three years?—Well, I am speaking now of the system generally.

18195. This is not your own case?—No, it is only my impression of the system generally.

18196. And the experience of your friends?—Yes, the experience of my friends coupled with my own.

18197. Now will you go on?—It is impossible for an inspector to form any idea of the progress made during the past year in a school at his first inspection of the school. Now, I think I had experience of that in Mr. Benson's visit. It was his first visit that I was pulled down on, or his first inspection I should say. An inspector should remain a number of years in the same circuit, and should bear his portion of the blame if his successor finds the organisation of the schools unsatisfactory. There should be frequent conferences between inspectors and teachers, especially when changes are made in the curriculum or new instructions issued to inspectors. There should not be a pretence of judging a school by inspection when really judging by the result of a permanent organisation. I think that if a class was examined in any subject that examination should be a thorough one, as far as that subject goes, on the easy parts of the programme, as well as the difficult parts of that particular subject. The proficiency of a class should not be condemned until the teacher is afforded an opportunity of examining the class in the presence of the inspector on the lines on which the subject has been taught by the teacher. I also think in junior standards the tests in arithmetic should not consist chiefly of problems. I think it is most important that the mechanical part of the subject should be thoroughly mastered in these standards, and much time must be devoted to this.

18198. Mr. KERR.—What is the mechanical part?—What I mean by the mechanical part is the mechanical part as distinguished from problems, for example, giving say a third class child a number of figures to multiply by 19—that is mechanical work. That is mechanical. But then it would be a problem if you were to make a statement and leave the child to draw some conclusion as to what the operation was to be.

18199. Mr. CORRY.—You are speaking of the importance of teaching them accuracy?—Yes, I like to have accuracy in multiplication, division, and so on, thoroughly grounded in the children before they begin to work problems. I have no hesitation in saying that we get over 90 per cent. of the answers correct out of all the questions that we give in arithmetic. The mechanical part of the subject should be thoroughly mastered in these standards, and much time must be devoted to this. Questions should not be given beyond the work recorded in the progress book. Where the methods of instruction are prescribed for a teacher, and he follows these methods conscientiously, he should not be held responsible for the result of the inspection. The teacher should be allowed considerable freedom in the organisation of his school. There should be some satisfactory Court of Appeal in case of disputes between teachers and inspectors.

18200. The CHAIRMAN.—That is the end of your notes?—That is the end of my notes. That last note about a satisfactory Court of Appeal deals with a matter that the teachers had rather seen upon.

18201. Mr. KAVANAGH.—I see that in 1910 there was no inspection?—No, sir.

18202. What was the reason of that, can you tell me?—I could not.

18203. It is not usual to omit inspection for one year?—Well, it may arise in this way, that they may be changing the times at which which inspectors hold examinations.

18204. I have never noticed it. Supposing that your increment had depended on that third year, 1910, you would have been entitled to the mark of the previous year, the "very good" of the previous year?—I doubt that.

18205. You do not think so?—I do not think so. I may be wrong, but I am afraid not.

18206. But your increment might have depended on that year?—It might; it is quite possible.

18207. Do you mean to say you would have been penalised because there was no inspection that year?—Well, I am afraid so. Now that I have seen part of the evidence upon what is necessary to get promotion, I think so. I would not have known then that it would be likely to penalise me, but now I believe it would.

18208. I should have thought that you could have claimed that the merit mark of the last year should hold good?—Well, I cannot say definitely, but I believe not. That is my impression.

18209. And you would have to wait till the next year, till they had an inspection, before your increment would be awarded?—I am afraid so.

18210. That is very strange?—I think that I am right in saying that.

18211. You say that you are in favour of conferences between inspectors and teachers. Are there any such conferences at the present time?—No, not any. I wish to mention specially on that, and I think it would be worth while taking it down, the way I would like to have the conferences.

18212. That is just what we want to hear?—Well, an inspector in going about from school to school will see something remarkably well done in one school; he will see some particular part of the programme remarkably well done by a teacher who has a special adaptability for teaching that subject. If the inspector then came to my school, and saw that I was not teaching that subject nearly as well as this other teacher he would say to me in a friendly way: "I saw the subject taught in such and such a way with great success. Now, would it not be worth your while to make a trial in teaching in the same way?" In that way the inspectors could help the teachers greatly. Then, if at certain intervals the inspectors were to gather the teachers together, and to talk over these particular subjects, and let everyone put forth what he considered the best methods of teaching the particular subjects, they could have a friendly discussion on the matter, and in that way I think we could benefit the children committed to our care, and further the interests of education in our land. That is what I mean by conferences.

18213. Would it be possible to get the teachers together in any one place for such a conference?—I am sure the teachers would be very glad to avail themselves of the opportunity.

18214. Within a circuit?—Yes. I know the teachers of a neighbouring association to my own invited an inspector to a conference of this kind, and I went out of my own district altogether in order to be present at that meeting, in order to try and benefit by it, but the inspector did not come.

18215. But there are 400 schools in each circuit on the average, and if you had 400 men assembled do you think it would be a conference that would work?—Well, it might not be possible to have the whole 400 assembled.

18216. You would have smaller conferences?—I would have, say, three different centres; so it would hardly be possible to get all the teachers of a circuit to one centre.

18217. The CHAIRMAN.—That would be about 140 teachers of each?—Yes.

18218. Mr. KAVANAGH.—And would the teachers like those conferences?—I have no doubt about it.

18219. It would bring you closer in touch with the inspector?—It would bring us closer in touch with the inspector, and would give us an insight into what the inspector would require of us, and then, again, it would enable us in a friendly way to discuss educational matters.

18220. Do you ever have conferences amongst yourselves, the teachers?—We do.

18221. In a circuit?—Well, we have a large association, and we generally have papers read at three readings on educational matters, and a discussion follows, so it partakes practically of the nature of a conference.

18222. That is within the circuit?—Yes.

18223. I do not mean your association?—Oh, no, it has nothing to do with the association; it is in our own town of Newtownards.

18224. You complain of the way that inspectors are moved about. How many years do you think it would take an inspector to get to know his district?—It would take him three or four years at least to get to know his own district.

18225. They are not left in a district very long?—Just when they get to know the district they are removed from it. Then about that Court of Appeal, perhaps somebody might ask me a question on that.

18226. We have heard a great deal about appeals. You have no confidence in appeals at the present time?—None whatever, because I do not know a single case where an appeal has been successful, nor have I heard of a single case where an appeal was successful.

18227. The teachers are simply afraid of being penalised on account of having appealed—would that be your opinion?—It is; I am afraid I was.

18228. How would you suggest that the appeal should be heard?—By an inspector or a man appointed for the purpose who was in no way connected with the circuit in which the appeal was made, or with the inspectors of the circuit—an independent man of some kind.

18229. That is a kind of referee?—As a kind of referee, and if that was thought too narrow a Commissioner or some other man should accompany him; but, of course, I would not suggest that a Commissioner should accompany him.

18230. You are speaking of an appeal against the report of an inspector?—An appeal against an inspection such as mine was when I felt aggrieved, unless there was some referee that I had confidence in to appeal to. Of course, I need not say that I have no confidence in the present mode of procedure. I have not.

18231. The CHAIRMAN.—And the referee might be one of the officials of the Board or an outsider?—I think he should be something to correspond to what our old head inspectors were.

18232. A higher official of the Board?—A higher official, but not in connection with the circuit.

18233. Not in connection with the circuit, but he might be a higher official?—A higher official.

18234. Such as chief inspector?—A chief inspector.

18235. I did not know whether you were suggesting somebody outside the system altogether or not?—I think it would be a good idea to have somebody outside the system to accompany him.

18236. Mr. COFFEY.—What time of the school year did Mr. Hosen was and examine your school when he reduced your mark?—January, just after the Christmas holidays, a short time after the Christmas holidays.

18237. And your summer holidays are in July?—Yes.

18238. So you would have the school year for August, September, October, November and December, about five months' work?—No, excuse me, Mr. Coffey, I let you go there, but you were wrong. My holidays were in September, so that I was five weeks off then, and I was two weeks off at Christmas, and then immediately after that, the week following that, I think it was, that my inspection took place.

18239. Then you had returned for a week or two after the Christmas holidays?—Yes, I was weeks off you see, and the inspection was on the 20th.

18240. It required some explanation, how a very high record of work should be upset by the visit of the inspector?—Yes, and I have a good record since I became a teacher.

18241. Were you one of the teachers in the Belfast circuit who signed the memorial?—I was not, because I was not lowered till the memorial was signed, or I would have been.

18242. What was your idea as to whether each school should have its own school year?—Well, with the present mode of inspection every school should have its own school year.

18243. What would the advantage be?—Well, then, an inspector would get a year's work to estimate. That would be an advantage, and the sole advantage.

18244. You think that the present system, by which an inspector is at liberty to go into a school and inspect it, and award his mark at the end of two or three months, is bound to lead to injustice?—I do. It is.

18245. There is another point that struck me in your evidence, in which I thought there was a great deal of substance, that the present system is half examination and half inspection?—Yes.

18246a. You think it should be either examination or inspection?—Yes.

18246b. And if there is examination of a class that examination should be thorough?—Yes. We object to an inspector walking into a class and asking a couple of questions, and then going away and basing his report on the answers to those couple of questions.

18247. Without a thorough examination?—Yes, without a thorough examination. If we are going to have inspection let us have it; if we are going to have examination let it be thorough.

18248. You think (and I think there is a great deal in it) that if an inspector examines a class and finds that they are not answering well, it would be right that the teacher should be called on to examine the class himself?—On that particular subject.

18249. And show how the children can assist themselves?—Yes.

18250. Because you consider it not only possible, but probable, that the children without consideration would fail to give satisfactory answers to out-of-the-way questions asked by some inspectors?—Yes; and in order to do away with the strained relations between inspectors and teachers, in order that there might be harmony, in the interests of the children, I think that so much of our salary should not depend upon a snatch visit that an inspector makes to our school.

18251. The BISHOP OF ROSA.—You said just now that you would wish to have either thorough inspection or thorough examination. Which of the two do you prefer yourself?—Well, I do not mind very much. If an inspector goes to examine on a subject, say, the arithmetic, it would not be necessary to examine the whole curriculum or the whole programme, but if he makes an examination on arithmetic, let it be one that would satisfy both him and the teacher, that the work

22nd July, 1918.]

Mr. WILLIAM ANDERSON examined.

[Continued.]

is either done or is not done. That is what I mean by a thorough examination. But I object to an inspection of a class, giving only one, or perhaps two, absurd questions, and then basing a report on that.

18202. Mr. HENLEY.—Give us a specimen of what you call absurd questions?—I think I have done so already, such as asking a child in fourth standard, "The easiest way for me to get to London."

18203. Mr. KAVANAUGH.—Was there any answer to that?—I do not think so.

18204. The CHAIRMAN or ROSS.—You think there is very little use in teaching a small child the principles on which the addition table is based. A child must learn the addition table by constant repetition?—I believe that, and I am thorough believer in it.

18205. And also the multiplication table has to be learned by constant repetition?—It cannot be done in any other way. That is my experience.

18206. Yes; so that the child will get to associate those numbers till they absolutely become mechanical to him?—Yes.

18207. And at that particular stage you do not think those subjects should be used to develop the intelligence of the child in the higher sense of the word?—Well, I would not say that they could not be used to develop the intelligence.

18208. But you would not think they are the best subjects for the purpose?—No.

18209. But you would not compare them with reading for developing a child's intelligence at that early stage?—I would not.

18210. Of course, later on, when they advance in arithmetic, you would wish them to know and understand the principles?—Certainly, whenever they are expert at the various processes.

18211. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—It would tend to prevent misunderstanding if no entry were made in the observation book without the inspector having a talk with the teacher about the subject of the proposed observation. Do you agree with that?—I believe it would prevent a good deal of misunderstanding, because most inspectors do not allow us to see the observation book until they leave, and then we find something like this written in it:—"The teachers are to talk so much for the pupils." That is a paragraph in mine.

18212. The CHAIRMAN.—What is that?—"The teachers are to talk so much for the pupils."

18213. What does that mean?—I don't know.

18214. Mr. COOPER.—Is that a paragraph in your observation book?—That is a paragraph in my observation book.

18215. Mr. HENLEY.—Does he mean that the teachers are not to talk so much?—I do not know. I have never been able to ascertain. Another paragraph was this:—"School Account Books are to be backed with clean brown paper."

18216. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—You were speaking of appeals, and you were also saying that so much ought not to depend upon the inspector's report. If your increment and promotion did not depend on the inspector's report the necessity for an appeal would be very largely done away with—it would.

18217. Mr. HENLEY.—Now, with reference to those conferences that you spoke about. Have you any experience yourself of the benefit to be derived from them?—No, only so far as the teachers are concerned, because I have never been at a conference where an inspector was present.

18218. Then it is only your view on the subject. It is only theoretical?—That is all.

18219. Now, there was attention drawn to the fact that you had got no inspection in 1910. Are you aware of Rule 69, which states that when the inspectors are able to report that a school is in a very efficient state it is not necessary to make a detailed inspection every year. Would not that rule be sufficient to account for the fact that you had no inspection in 1910—you were after getting six "very goods," and therefore your school must be considered to have been in a highly efficient state?—Yes, but I never knew an instance.

18220. But answer the question, Would not that rule be sufficient to account for the fact that you had no inspection in 1910?—Probably it might.

18221. The CHAIRMAN.—Then would the previous mark be repeated?—I am afraid not.

Then how about increments?—would not increments not count for that vacant year?—would the teacher be punished?

Mr. HENLEY.—I do not think so.

Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—It says that a detailed inspection would not be necessary, and, therefore, it does not do away with the necessity for an inspection, but it is only necessary for the inspector to satisfy himself by inspection, and inspection alone, that the school has not gone down in any degree.

Mr. HENLEY.—The inspector is supposed to visit three times in the year, but we have evidence apart from that rule that the inspectors have been requested to concentrate on the inefficient schools.

18222. The CHAIRMAN.—I want to know how it would practically work with regard to promotion and increment. You have no information about that?—I am not able to give you any, sir.

The CHAIRMAN.—That question has never been raised.

18223. Mr. HENLEY.—I think not. Mr. HENSON came to you in 1911. The point has been raised that the pupils that you then had were a mixture from three schools?—Yes.

18224. And they could not be all as good material as when you were getting all the "very goods." Was that the fact?—No.

18225. Why not?—Because it was still in the same school and under the same conditions that Mr. HENSON inspected.

18226. He marked in the same school before the amalgamation with the same pupils getting the same teaching?—Yes.

18227. And that was teaching which has been characterised in these reports as being intelligent?—Yes.

18228. And you have been mentioned as competent, efficient, industrious, and a number of other epithets, of which you may pretty well be proud. Did Mr. HENSON in any way discuss with you this report then?—No, not in any way.

18229. Did you find him helpful to you in any way in order to remove defects from your school?—Certainly not.

18230. For instance, when he said, "More thought and intelligence are needed in the method of conducting the school," could you tell from that what he was aiming at?—No.

18231. Nor was it explained to you?—No, it was not; I thought my school was conducted intelligently.

18232. Then, again, "Defects exist in the division of the work, in the grouping of the standards, and in the method of instruction. Is that correct?—The standards were grouped properly together.

18233. You are aware that the Commissioners profess to give freedom of organisation of the school?—Yes.

18234. Can you reconcile that rule as to freedom of organisation with defects of grouping being referred to by the inspector and those defects not pointed out?—Certainly not; I cannot reconcile them at all, and I have said that here in my general evidence.

18235. "There is too little instruction of a connected nature affecting the mental development of the pupils." What does that refer to?—I do not know, because each of the other inspectors commended me for drawing out the intelligence of the pupils and developing it.

18236. And you were about that time expecting the amalgamation of these three schools, with increased numbers and a prospect of promotion?—Yes.

18237. And therefore I presume that we may take it that you were working at your dead level best. He says that "At two separate times the work was differently arranged to the time-table, and the grouping of the classes was at times very injudicious." Had that time-table been submitted in accordance with the rule to the inspector?—Yes, it had.

22nd July, 1913.]

Mr. WILMAK ANDERSON examined.

[Continued.]

18299. And approved by him?—Yes, it had been; it was the time-table that I taught under for years.

18299. Without alterations?—Yes.

18299. Had it been sent a short time previously to the Inspector for his approval?—Yes.

18299. And approved by him?—Mr. O'Connell approved of it.

18299. And then it was a case of Mr. Hanna objecting to Mr. O'Connell's arrangements?—Yes.

18299. Now, with regard to the Court of Appeal which you refer to, you say, first, that you appealed against that inspection?—I did.

18299. And that you know of no cases in which an appeal ever succeeded?—Yes.

18299. Have you never heard of any teacher gaining anything by appealing?—I heard of a teacher gaining an increment, but I never heard of a teacher getting his mark raised, never; and the mark is even of more importance to the teacher than the money attached to the mark.

18299. I quite agree with you in that; the money is a mere secondary thing?—The money in my case was a secondary thing, because I served as fine reports when there was no money held out to me.

18299. It has been given in evidence here that the mark of a school should be determined by the permanent aspects of the school, and the permanent aspects of the school depend on the character of the teacher. Now, that evidence has been given on very high authority. Was that regulation complied with in your case?—Certainly not, or I would have got "very good" still.

18299. You believe that the character of your school has been weakened?—I do.

18299. And I suppose I may say without any flattery that your character did not undergo any change for the worse?—I do not think so.

18299. And yet notwithstanding your appeal, and notwithstanding the fact that the permanent aspects of your school remain unchanged, still you got nothing from the appeal?—No, nothing.

18299. So that while the arrangements that have been made by the Commissioners are in some respects satisfactory, the administration of those arrangements does not seem to be satisfactory?—It is not satisfactory to the teachers at all.

18299. Mr. COOPER.—Is it your experience that the observation book is not of very great value to the

teacher?—It is, because the observations put in the observation book are not calculated to assist us in the work of our schools.

18299. Then it is your experience that the observation book is not of any particular value at all to the teacher?—Yes, that is my experience.

18299. And I suppose if it were abolished you would not find that you had suffered an irreparable loss?—Well, if it had been abolished in my case I would have suffered no loss whatever.

18299. Well, with regard to those conferences, do you think, so long as a teacher's increment depends on an inspector's report, and that the inspector has that considerable control over the teacher, you could have any free exchange of opinion between the teachers and the inspectors?—Certainly not.

18299. Would there not be a complete lack of freedom?—Yes.

18299. So that under the present system those conferences would be without any value?—Without any value.

18299. So you had in view some change of system when you advocated that?—Yes, I had.

18299. His Lordship illustrated that point about concentrating on the mechanical processes in arithmetic. Does not the explanation that you gave apply to some extent also to the teaching of reading to young children?—Yes, of course, it does.

18299. Of course, the reading of children at the beginning is almost mechanical?—Of course, it cannot be anything but mechanical.

18299. Later on in the higher standards you expect more?—In the higher standards we explain the language and draw out the child's intelligence. For example, in the last lesson that I gave in reading we had these words, "standing on the prow of the boat," and I asked the children what was meant by prow, and a little fellow said it was the bow of the boat. I followed that up by asking for an instance where that word "bow" was pronounced differently, and had a different meaning, and after a little thought he pointed to a little girl in front of him and said, "that bow in that girl's hair." Well, I thought that I was developing the intelligence of that boy in that way. When the mechanical difficulties are got over then you can develop the intelligence.

FORTIETH DAY.—WEDNESDAY, JULY 23RD, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

PRESENT:—Sir SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (CHAIRMAN); The Most Rev. DENIS KELLY, D.D.; Bishop of Ross; Sir HIRSH SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN COFFEY; Mr. HENRICH E. B. HARRISON, B.A.; Mr. JEREMIAH HENLY; Mr. WALTER MCMURROUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.; Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL KETTLE, B.L.; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Mr. JOHN A. GIBSE, Principal of Sydenham National School, Belfast, examined.

18307. You are principal of Sydenham National School?—Yes.

18307. And before you became principal of Sydenham you were principal of Ballydrain?—Yes; Ballydrain, Comber, County Down.

18307. Now, had you any school before Ballydrain?—Yes, I was teacher for two years at Barnanaghery, in the Downpatrick district, near Safefield. I was principal of that school, and I have been all my life as principal, ever since I began to teach.

18307. You have been principal during all your years of service?—Yes.

18307. When did you begin?—I began service in 1881.

18307. First in Barnanaghery?—Yes; for two years and some months.

18307. And then you went to Ballydrain, near Comber?—Yes.

18307. How long were you there?—11 years and 9 months.

18307. And in that school the average was under 70?—Yes, under 70; scarcely up to it; some years it did reach 70.

22nd July, 1913.]

Mr. JOHN A. GREGG examined.

[Continued.]

18323. The character of your reports in Ballydrain was "very good"?—Yes; from 1901 to 1906, inclusive, "very good," "excellent," "good," "very good," "very good," "very good."

18324. Were you at Ballydrain when the new system was introduced?—Yes, I was in it in 1894. While I was in Barmenaghery School Mr. Sheffington, the inspector, mentioned me specially in the Blue Book, in the 63rd Report for the year 1896-7. He mentioned my work.

18325. Mr. HENLEY.—Read what he says, please!—(Reads extract from report of Commissioners.) That is on page 123 of the 63rd Report of the Commissioners, the appendix to the 63rd Report.

18326. The CHAIRMAN.—In your report you say that on the consolidation of the salaries you were an inter-grade between first and second grade, but under the old system you were a first class teacher. In 1900 your position was changed?—Yes.

18327. Will you explain it to us briefly?—Well, when the salaries were consolidated I was not high enough to get into first grade.

18328. Your attendance was not high enough?—No; the average of the consolidation of my salary for the preceding three years was not high enough to admit me into the first grade, but allowed me to be between the top of the second grade and the bottom of the first grade.

18329. The CHAIRMAN.—That is what you mean by inter-grade?—It was commonly called "inter-grade," and that was the official name given to those teachers.

18330. While you were at Ballydrain you were promoted?—I was promoted to first grade, and received an increment.

18331. And your report that year was only "good"?—Only "good." I was reduced from "excellent" to "good."

18332. By Mr. Chambers?—Yes; the first visit of Mr. Chambers to me.

18333. But in spite of that you got your increment?—Yes. The three marks are "very good," "excellent," and "good," and I did not require three "very goods."

18334. We know that?—In 1906 I received the final increment of this grade on the three previous years' reports. It was in the beginning of 1906 that I took up duties at Sydenham.

18335. Then you give your Ballydrain reports:—1901, "very good"; 1902, "excellent"; 1903, "good"; and then follow three "very goods" to 1906, and on those three "very goods" you got your last increment?—Yes.

18336. Now, will you proceed?—When I took up duties in Sydenham the school was in a very bad state, as is shown by the reports, and from the opinion of the inspector, who characterized it as the "worst school in the district, if not the worst in Ireland."

18337. Where did he state that?—Privately to me when I wrote to Mr. Chambers. It was in the same district as Ballydrain, and I wrote to him asking him what kind of a school it was, and he wrote that in reply to me.

18338. Mr. HENLEY.—Have you that letter?—I have not that letter, unfortunately.

18339. The CHAIRMAN.—Then you say you decided to change it?—However, as I could get no further promotion in Ballydrain I decided to change in the hope of gaining first of first grade. I then came to Sydenham. Mr. Chambers held the annual inspection of Sydenham when I was just six weeks in the school. He stated—"The discipline, which was extremely bad under the late principal, is now satisfactory. However, as the children are now attentive to their work, I have no doubt that the improvement in the proficiency will soon be as great as that already effected in the discipline."

18340. What was the number of children in Sydenham School when you went to it?—The average for the year ending 1906, when I arrived, was 35, and the percentage of attendance was 58 per cent. The average for all Belfast is always about 75 to 76, and the percentage of attendance at that time at Sydenham was 58 per cent. for the year. When Mr. Chambers visited the school as inspector he used to go round, as he told me himself, he had to run round by the book, and run as fast as he could to count the

children when he wanted to check the rolls. That was the school that I entered into and where I am now.

18341. What is your number now?—The number on the roll at the present time is 186.

18342. And what is your average attendance?—My attendance average for the past fortnight was 145, and the percentage of attendance 82 per cent., that is 6 per cent. higher than the average of Belfast. Mr. Chambers was removed from the district then on his promotion to senior inspector. I have quoted his opinion of the first six weeks of my work in Sydenham, and he knew the previous history of the school, and also my capabilities as a teacher, from his previous visit to Ballydrain National School.

18343. Now, will you give the reports of Sydenham before you became principal?—They were "fair," "fair," "good," "middling," "fair."

18344. Mr. Chambers had given it the mark "fair" in 1905, before you arrived?—Yes.

18345. Then you speak of how you entered on your duties?—Yes; I entered on my duties with zeal and enthusiasm. I organised a Workmen's Committee, and in three months raised locally a sum of £20.

18346. Who was the manager of Sydenham?—The Rev. W. J. Fawcett. The school is in connection with Strand Presbyterian School, a small church.

18347. Do you mean to say that you had to provide money for the upkeep of the school?—No; I do not mean to say that, but that money was raised locally by that Committee.

18348. For what?—To improve the school, as it was in a very bad state.

18349. It was for the upkeep and equipment of the school?—Yes. But I should say that just before I went there Mr. Fawcett, out of the Church funds, had expended over £40 in providing new cloths, &c.

18350. Does that particular Church regard itself as responsible for the upkeep of that school?—Yes; it still pays the ground rent, and pays for the cleaning of the school, and everything in connection with it at present, and has done it, and is still doing it.

18351. Is any expense thrown on you for the upkeep of the school?—None whatever in this particular case. At Easter, 1906, we expended the £30 on materials and school requisites; the tradesmen of the district who had children at the school giving me their services free, and making improvements during the Easter recess. After one year's work Mr. McConnell inspected, and stated (on the 14th of March, 1907)—"The condition of this school has considerably improved during the past year, and still further progress may be expected under the present capable and hard-working teachers." His most mark was "good."

18352. That was following "fair"?—Following "fair." In the following year, 1908, Mr. Dewar inspected, on the 27th of January, and gave "good." His report contained the following remarks:—"The teachers are energetic and assiduous, but they should give much more thought to the mode of conducting their school, so that their own efforts may be as effective as possible. The instruction is rather mechanical." I pointed out to Mr. Dewar the former state of the school.

18353. You had only been there a year and a half?—At that time I had been there two years. I pointed out to him the former state of the school and the efforts I had made to improve it, but he did not seem to give this much consideration. By the way, I may say that when I spoke to him about the state of the school he said—"You do not seem to give any credit to the inspectors that they know about these things from the note-books of their predecessors." In March, 1909, Mr. O'Connell again inspected, and again gave "good," and in his report he stated—"This school is overcrowded at present, and the work of instruction is, consequently, carried on under difficulties. Under the circumstances the teachers discharge their duties with fidelity and success. The children work quietly and steadily, and the school-room and premises are cleanly kept."

18354. Does that overcrowding still continue?—Yes, it does; but it was that year and the previous year, 1907, at the end of it or the beginning of the next, that we made a move to get a new school.

22nd July, 1913.]

Mr. JOHN A. GREGG examined.

[Continued.]

18355. There has been a effort to get a new school?—
Yes.

18356. But there are difficulties with the Board?—
Yes. We have overcome these difficulties, and the new building is being now started.

18357. They raised £2,300 for that?—£2,600.

18358. Where is that building to be placed?—It is to be placed down in the fields not very far from Victoria Park. It is down towards Hollywood—towards the Hollywood direction. In this same year, 1909, I had an incidental visit in May from Mr. Dewar and Miss Pye. He observed: "I am pleased to note that the teaching was of an effective character. Miss Browne gave a very good reading lesson, and the pupils showed facility in imitating her style. Miss Christy taught drawing well to the senior infants, and secured good execution. Drawing was also very carefully taught to the senior pupils by the principal."

18359. In 1910 you had your fourth inspection?—
In 1910 my fourth inspection in Synnabrook School was carried out by Mr. Franklin, a junior inspector unattached, and he also awarded the school "good," and he wrote in the Observation Book:—"General proficiency is satisfactory, the proficiency rising sometimes to 'very good'—for instance, the handwriting and some of the reading. The written work is generally exceedingly neat, but I think more time might be given to composition in senior standards." Mr. Franklin, in his report on that inspection stated:—"This school would be marked 'very good' were it not that the written work of the seniors does not reach a satisfactory standard. On the whole, the school work is systematically conducted, and the general training of the children is satisfactory." The noting in the Observation Book and the report on the same inspection did not agree.

18360. In what respect?—The Observation Book stated:—"The general proficiency is satisfactory; the proficiency rising sometimes to very good."

18361. And he only gave you "good"?—Yes.

18362. And your meaning is that the observations in the Observation Book seem to point to your getting the mark "very good," whereas you only got "good"?—
Yes. The point is that he says the school would be marked "very good" were it not that the written work of the seniors does not reach a satisfactory standard. Although he says in the Observation Book:—"General proficiency is satisfactory, the proficiency sometimes rising to 'very good'—for instance, the handwriting and some of the reading."

18363. You say the noting and the report did not agree?—Yes; and as I did not consider myself fairly treated I decided to appeal.

18364. You appealed through your manager?—No, sir, I did not; I appealed through the influence of a Commissioner.

18365. I want you to explain that statement. Is it not the regular system to make your appeal through the manager?—Yes, sir; but I did not like to do that. I did not want to make it a regular appeal, and to have the inspector to think that I was just appealing against what had been done. For various reasons I did not like to do that; and I wanted my appeal to go through a Commissioner because Dr. Clarke had visited my school that year.

18366. Dr. Clarke was the Commissioner?—Yes, Dr. Clarke.

18367. You thought your appeal would be more effective and would damage you less?—Yes; because Dr. Clarke had been in the school, and had seen the state of the building, and we had got him to see this place in connection with the new school.

18368. And what was the date of that appeal?—The date of the inspection was the 24th of June, and Mr. Dewar came on the 24th of October, 1910.

18369. Mr. Dewar came on the 24th of October?—
Yes.

18370. But when did your appeal go up?—I did not send a formal appeal at all; it was through Dr. Clarke.

18371. It was not a formal appeal?—It was not a formal appeal.

18372. You simply made a communication to Dr. Clarke?—Yes; I wrote to Dr. Clarke.

18373. The word "appeal" is rather misleading, because I took it to be a formal appeal?—It was not a formal appeal, but it was an appeal all the same, because Mr. Dewar was sent to me.

18374. You got this Commissioner to secure a re-inspection?—Yes.

18375. And then Mr. Dewar was sent down for that re-inspection?—Yes; and the following is the style of notes he made in the Observation Book:—"Pay special attention to order and discipline, so that the work may be carried on quietly and effectively. Unnecessary noise always interferes with the effectiveness of the teacher's efforts."

18376. He came at 11.35 and stayed till 3.10?—Yes. I have left his observations here; and a word was written with regard to the general efficiency or a word of praise given to encourage; he left nothing but a series of pin-pricks, which were in no manner of any educational value, and the teachers felt much discouraged.

18377. Can you illustrate that by referring to his observations?—Yes, those that I have just read out:—"Pay special attention to order and discipline." No. 2 was:—"More progress should be shown in needlework; the material might be somewhat finer, and the stitches finer and neater. In button-holes special care is required. Specimens are rather coarse and uneven." I may say in connection with that, that we had a visit from Miss Lee, the needlework organizer, sometimes previously, and she was very much pleased with the needlework. Miss Lee had pointed out to the teacher in charge of the needlework not to use such fine cloth as she was doing, but Mr. Dewar said the cloth was too coarse. The organizer said fine cloth should be used for senior class needlework, but for young children the cloth should be coarse and the stitches somewhat long, and we were following the advice of the expert, and Mr. Dewar found fault with it.

18378. Have you any other example?—Yes:—"Don't have too much grammar work done on paper. Aim at teaching, so that the pupils will thoroughly grasp the instruction. Never stop a child when answering a question; let the answer be wrong or right, encourage the child to complete his answer, and then the correction will afford the teacher an opportunity of impressing the correct answer on the pupils' memory and mind. Never allow pupils to write with short pencils. Short pencils induce wrong methods of holding the pencil or pen. Take care and do not read too long example paragraphs for pupils, especially those in the junior classes."—E. P. Dewar. 24/10/10. These were his observations on the appeal inspection. On that day he walked through the school observing trivialities and nagging them. He joked with the pupils, and I would not have objected to this had it not had an injurious influence on the discipline. He said to me that day that when he entered a school at first the children were generally quiet, and afraid of the inspector, but when he went among them for some time and joked and chatted to them freely they soon resumed their normal condition, and he could then observe how the work was generally conducted. This, however, was not so in my case, as the pupils proved noisier on that day than on ordinary occasions owing to his familiarity. Besides, he occupied a good deal of my time in conversation regarding trifling matters, and he did not see the school in its normal working order.

18379. In short, he did not give you then apparently any advice that helped you?—None whatever, sir.

18380. Do you find, as a rule, that the inspectors help you by advice?—I have been teaching 28 years, and I am now in my 23rd year of teaching, and I have never yet got any help from any inspector. I give you an example in the case of Mr. Hullah. He pointed out to me, and said, "You have too many infants in that room." I said, "We know that; and we have tried to plan and to think how we could remove some of the children to the bigger room, and we could not do it because each teacher has two classes." And I said, "Can you point out how it

3rd July, 1918.]

Mr. JOHN A. GANNE examined.

[Continued.]

could be done, and I shall fall in with what you say in regard to it?" "Oh, no," he said, "but if I were on the spot I think I could arrange some plan, but I have not time now." I said, "Come any time you like, and I shall be pleased to carry out your instructions."

18381. Mr. CORRY.—Did he come again?—No, sir.

18382. The CHAIRMAN.—Then you speak of 17 months' before?—Yes, 17 months' before, at an incidental visit, in May, 1909, all seemed right, but now, in the case of my appeal, everything was wrong.

18383. Did the Board communicate with you after the visit?—No, sir. His notes of the latter visit contradicted those of the former. When leaving he asked me to accompany him outside, and we had a conversation regarding the school. Among other observations he said that the general proficiency had improved since his last visit—it was now higher than "good," but not "very good."

18384. He wanted another merit mark?—Yes. I asked him if he had come specially on my appeal, but he refused to say so. I afterwards heard from the Commissioner who interested himself in my case that this visit was the outcome of my appeal, which was, therefore, fruitless; so you see it was not a regular official appeal.

18385. The Board did not communicate the result of it to you?—They did not, but Dr. Clarke did. My manager wrote to Dr. Starke, pointing out the great improvement which had taken place in the tone and general proficiency of the school. Mr. Homan conducted the next inspection, on 29th May, 1911, and gave "good," although in October previously, according to Mr. Dewar, the proficiency was higher than "good." Mr. Homan's method of inspection was not satisfactory to manager, teachers or pupils.

18386. Was Mr. Fawcett present at that?—Mr. Fawcett had left and gone to Armagh, and the manager was then the Rev. Mr. Maxwell, who succeeded.

18387. Was he present at this inspection?—He was, on the morning of the day. He left in the afternoon. Mr. Homan was accompanied then by young Mr. Holden. The manager expressed this opinion at the time—that Mr. Homan seemed to be like one performing an unpleasant duty; at least he gave them that impression. The assistants and I decided to appeal, but as so little came out of the previous appeal we concluded it was better to grin and bear, and hope for better at the next inspection.

18388. You thought of appealing, but you did not do so?—Yes. Mr. Keith conducted the inspection on 26th March, 1912, but nevertheless, after another year's strenuous work, and improvements commented on by him again, we were awarded "good," decidedly good, as he terms it in his notes.

18389. That is another merit mark?—Yes. Therefore, I was higher than "good" with Mr. Dewar, remained stationary with Mr. Homan, was decidedly good the following year with Mr. Keith, and it was only in my next and seventh inspection, this year, 1913, that I attained "very good," from Mr. Kelly, senior inspector. That was on the inspection of the 10th and 11th June, 1913, last month.

18390. And you got "very good"?—I got "very good" after seven years strenuous work. Now this was the only year, except 1907 (1907, I may say, was my first year in which I raised this school from "fair" to "good," and I could not have expected any more), this was the only year, except in 1907, that I received justice for the work done; and, strange to say, this was the only year I was ever absent from illness since I came to Sydenham.

18391. How long were you absent?—I was more than a month off duty previous to the inspection, and the work of my classes 5 and 6, devolved upon the assistant who taught third and fourth.

18392. He must be a very competent man?—It was a lady teacher. Mr. Kelly gave the school a thorough examination, which satisfied all concerned, and the test proved that the school was worthy of a senior inspector's "very good." I feel assured that the facts of my case, when carefully examined, go to prove the teachers' contention—first, that the system of award-

ing merit marks is not always a fair or just estimate of the work done in the school; second, that there is not uniformity of inspection under the present system; and, thirdly, that appeals are useless.

18393. Mr. KAVANAGH.—You say that the school was overcrowded and the premises were bad?—Yes; very bad, indeed.

18394. Do you not think that that affected the report all through?—Well, according to what an inspector said, it did not; it was to be taken into consideration in our favour.

18395. It should have been?—I am afraid from the remark dropped by an inspector to me that it was against me.

18396. Then you said the people in the locality spent a certain sum of money on the school?—Yes; that was for trifling improvements and putting the school in working order.

18397. You would not say that the school was really efficient in the way of building now?—No, I would not.

18398. Are you overcrowded still?—Well, according to the Corporation Law and what they allow, I am slightly overcrowded.

18399. What is the number?—About 180 on the roll at present; 145 attendance. If I had the premises I would have over 200. Our new school is being built for nominally 200.

18400. When is it to be finished?—The contractors see to have it finished in March, and I am permitted to have a little larger attendance than the inspectors would otherwise allow me. In this new school we are building for a higher average than on what the Board are granting. The Board are allowing for 170, and we are arranging for getting a grant on 200, and when we get into the school we shall get the extra grant at once.

18401. I suppose you would have no trouble?—No; and we would have accommodation for another 100.

18402. And you practically appealed to Dr. Starke?—Yes, practically appealed.

18403. It was just as much an appeal really, because Mr. Dewar was sent down to report?—Yes, he was, immediately.

18404. Well, his report on the appeal was worse than the one you complained of before?—Oh, yes, very much worse. There was no redress in that case whatever; and, as I have told you, there was no communication to guide me or to point out what I should do, or anything to go upon.

18405. He did not lower the mark?—He did not lower the mark, but I wanted it raised, because I was then ready for promotion.

18406. And afterwards you said you preferred to grin and bear it?—Yes; I would not undergo the ordeal of an appeal again.

18407. You had no confidence?—I had no confidence in the Commissioners.

18408. Do you think the fact of your appealing affected you adversely at all?—Well, I would not just like to say so. All I know is that when Mr. Homan came (it was Mr. Homan that examined the following year), I know that on the day of the inspection he was not in a very good frame of mind; but whether on account of the appeal or on account of any other thing I would not like to say.

18409. But still it appears to me that you were steadily improving, and always getting nearer and nearer to the "very good," which you have attained at present?—Yes, the school must have improved, because it jumped up that one year, and it could not remain at a dead level for six years.

18410. It took a long time to improve?—A very long time.

18411. And, naturally, would you not say from the state that the inspector found it in at first it would take some time to improve?—Yes; it took a very considerable time to improve, because when I went to the school the highest class was third standard.

18412. I am afraid I cannot follow altogether your explanation. You have arrived at the "very good," which you, no doubt, deserved?—But it would not take six years for a man to obtain "very good" who always had "very good" for a number of years before it.

23rd July, 1918.]

Mr. JOHN A. GANGE examined.

[Continued.]

18435. But not in the same school?—But I had everything to gain by striving to do good work, and to do my best.

18436. And you effected a marked improvement in the school, but possibly you are wishing to advance too quickly. But I won't pursue that now. You say the system of awarding merit marks is not always just and fair in estimating the work of the school. Would you say that it was too superficial and not enough of examination?—Well, under the present system of inspectors that we have, examination would be very much fairer to the teacher, because even when inspectors do inspect it is a regular examination, for they take percentages, so that it is really examination. The slightest inspection they make is an examination.

18437. Would you rather have more examination?—With the present system and the present inspectors.

18438. There seemed to be uniformity in your case, and all the inspectors seemed to agree?—If there was uniformity in the following years there could not have been in the first year, because I jumped from "fair" to "good" in the first year, and if you assume that there was uniformity then in the latter years the first mark was not right.

18439. It was too high?—It must have been too high. If the latter marks were right, the first year must have been too high.

18440. How many inspectors had you in all those years?—I had Mr. O'Connor, Mr. Dewar, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Homan, Mr. Keith and Mr. Kelly—that is, six in the last seven years.

18441. The only change in the mark was the year you have got at present?—Yes; this was gained by thorough examination and the others by partial inspection and examination.

18442. Now, have you any suggestion to make as to appeals which would enable the teachers to feel a little more confidence that their appeals would be heard?—Well, in the old days of the head inspectors, when one had to appeal to a head inspector the teachers felt more confidence in it, and you were wiser of getting justice than under the present system, when the case is decided by the senior inspector. I was condemned by Mr. Dewar. He was the man that condemned, and no one could raise me until the senior inspector came round again. I appealed from a junior inspector, and the senior inspector is sent on my appealing.

18443. You appealed practically to the same man?—Yes, to the same man; and one could not feel confidence in that.

18444. You want a man who was independent of all the inspectors?—Yes, of all the inspectors.

18445. A kind of referee?—Yes; there should be something of that. For instance, if the chief inspector was sent, if someone independent of the school or district came round, or something of that sort, we would have more confidence in it, but when it is the man in charge of your school it is a different thing.

18446. Have you known any other teachers, of your own knowledge, appealing without success?—Oh, yes, I have. Mr. Smyth, of Lisburn, who is first class, appealed without success, and then he had a second appeal.

18447. And you represent the opinion of your friends in the neighbourhood when you said that you have no confidence in the appeal?—Oh, yes, I have not met any teacher yet that has confidence. I have talked the matter over with teachers, and I have not met anyone with any confidence in the appeal under the present circumstances.

18448. Mr. Corry.—What did you understand by that remark of Mr. Dewar's, in which he said that the teachers should give more thought to their work?—More thought to the working of the school—I could not say what he meant by that.

18449. Had you not given all your thoughts?—I had given all my thoughts to it, and had tried to improve myself in every way. I could not see any meaning in it whatever, and could not take any meaning out of it, and I was striving in every way to improve the school and to improve myself at the same time. You were in my school, Mr. Coffey, and must have seen how it was conducted.

18450. Yes, I have been in many schools. There was a remark, you say, by an inspector that the condition of the building operated against you?—Yes.

18451. What did the inspector say?—Well, what the inspector said to me was that. I was talking to him at an incidental visit, and I was pointing out that with all the striving I had made I had only attained "good," and said he, "Well, Mr. Grogg, what more could you expect in a building like that?" and up to that time I always thought that the condition of the building was taken into consideration in favour of the teacher.

18452. Two of your inspectors, while you were trying to get higher than "good," seemed to indicate that you deserved something that was better than "good," because one said that you were "decidedly good"?—Yes, Mr. Keith said that.

18453. There were two observations which suggested that the mark "good" was not high enough?—The general state of the school, considering the circumstances, is decidedly good." That was by Mr. Keith, on the 27th of March, 1912.

18454. And there was another inspector who said it was more than "good"?—Yes, in 1910, Mr. Franklin, junior inspector, said—"This school would be marked 'very good' were it not that the written work of the seniors does not reach a satisfactory standard."

18455. Both those inspectors considered it higher than "good," but there was a gentleman who came in between, Mr. Homan, who did not say anything about higher than "good."

18456. The Bruner or Ross.—There is only one question I want to ask you arising from what you said a minute ago. You said that Mr. Keith remarked that, considering the circumstances of your school, it was "decidedly good"?—Yes, my lord.

18457. Does not the inference seem to be that he made allowance or gave you credit for the circumstances of your school?—The inference might be either for or against; it might be either way.

18458. Will you read it?—"The general state of the school, considering the circumstances, is decidedly good." That is the whole sentence.

18459. You think it is open to either interpretation, that he took the circumstances in your favour or against it?—Yes, I believe that.

18460. That written remark impressed my mind as showing that the circumstances were taken in your favour?—Well, it might be either way.

18461. Sir HERMAN WILLIAMS.—You made a remark that on Mr. Chambers' first visit to Hollydrain School he reduced your school from "excellent" to "good." That is two points?—Yes.

18462. Do you consider that that was because of this being his first report?—No, I consider that from a different standpoint. Mr. Chambers, if I may say it, seemed to me when he came on his first visit to be against—well, perhaps, I should not say that he seemed to be against, but not friendly, to the new system. I had been attending the organizer's class at Newtownards, I had been sent by the Board to attend it, and I had done so, and the organizer gave instructions to all the teachers who attended to teach paper-folding and drawing, to teach the subjects in our schools the way that he had taught it to us, and I did so. When the inspection came round Mr. Chambers asked me who gave me authority to do this, and I said I had been attending the organizer's class, and that I had done so according to the instructions he gave me. He said, "You have no instructions from the Board, it is not in the programme of instruction." And I said, "Don't other teachers do it?" And he said, "I know they do, but you have no instructions from the Board or anyone else to do it," and Mr. Chambers then did not seem pleased with the drawing and some other things, and he lowered me from "excellent" to "good."

18463. Did you alter your system after hearing what Mr. Chambers said?—Oh, yes; I dropped the paper-folding and the drawing at once, and never took them up again.

22nd July, 1913.]

Mr. JOHN A. GRANT examined.

[Continued.]

18442. And Mr. Chambers evidently approved of your action in that year, and he raised your mark at his next visit?—Yes; he never mentioned again having those things or said a word about them. He was pleased, and I was much better pleased, sir.

18443. Now, I did not quite gather whether you had lost by the mark of the school having been reduced?—Yes, I have lost. I ought to have received promotion in 1909 to first of first grade if I had received the report, which, unfortunately, I did not.

18444. You ought to have been promoted?—Yes, to first of first grade; an increase of £12.

18445. In 1909?—Yes.

18446. Then what reports would you have required for that?—Well, the first year I had "good." I believe I would have got promotion if I had got "good," "very good," and "very good."

18447. The CHAIRMAN.—You have been asked what marks would entitle you to it?—The official statement is three "very goods," but possibly I would have got promotion if I got "good," "very good," "very good," "very good," and "very good." I was in jumping the school from "fair" to "very good" as once, it rose up the first year. If Mr. Dewar had given me "very good," and if Mr. O'Connell, who succeeded, had done the same thing I would have got promotion. I firmly believe, for the work done, because it was in a working class district, and I had very, very hard uphill work, as you see what the state of the school was when I went into it.

18448. Would "very good" have been inconsistent with the remarks about proficiency made in the Observation Book?—Well, I do not think it would, because the proficiency had in my estimation been "very good."

18449. It says, "The general proficiency is satisfactory, the proficiency rising sometimes to 'very good'."—Yes, that is in a later year.

18450. What was your report in 1907?—In 1907 Mr. O'Connell gave me "good."

18451. And he said, "The condition of this school has considerably improved during the past year, and still further progress may be expected under the present energetic and hard-working teachers."—Yes.

18452. In the following year Mr. Dewar inspected, and gave you "good"?—Yes.

18453. He said, "The teachers are energetic and assiduous, but they should give much more thought to the mode of conducting their school, so that their own efforts may be as effective as possible. The instruction is rather mechanical," there does not seem to be any way of arriving at what he meant there?—I cannot see what he meant by instruction being rather mechanical. I never could understand it, because we were teaching to the very best of our ability, all the assistants and myself.

18454. You do not seem to have had a conversation with him?—Not till the appeal.

18455. You say you pointed out to Mr. Dewar the former state of the school and the efforts you had made to improve it?—Yes; I said that to him in the school at the time.

18456. That was at the time of his inspection?—Yes.

18457. And Mr. O'Connell again gave you "good," and said, "This school is overcrowded at present, and the work of instruction is consequently carried on under difficulties. Under the circumstances, the teachers discharge their duty with fidelity and success. The children work quietly and steadily, and the school-room and premises are cleanly kept." Now, was there anything else in the observations that would detract from that so as to explain his not giving you "very good"?—That is the whole report, unless that some slowness has been blown down by a recent storm.

18458. And that is the whole report?—That is the whole report.

18459. And it was on that report he marked it less than "very good"?—Yes; and I can read the minutes in the Observation Book:—"This school is greatly crowded at present, and the work of the teachers is rendered more difficult thereby. A good deal of sound

and useful work is done, and the English lessons are used to develop the intelligence of the children. The instruction in arithmetic is not satisfactory. In the first standard arithmetic was only 'fair,' and the tables were not thoroughly learned, and the pupils were not expert. The third standard evinced weakness on questions involving a little thought, and the fifth and sixth standards are also weak, and do easy arithmetic exercises. Discipline and order are very good."

18460. As to the observation that in the first standard arithmetic was only "fair" and the tables were not thoroughly learned, is it necessary that those children should learn their tables so accurately?—Yes, I think that was quite allowable.

18461. That they should learn their tables accurately?—Oh, yes, that was required.

18462. Mr. COOPER.—But is it required; is it laid down in the Board's directions?—Well, it is laid down in the "Notes for Teachers," that is the method to do it.

18463. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—When was that done?—I cannot just say at the present moment, but I know that the teachers are directed to teach according to the method laid down in the further programmes, and as outlined by the notes.

18464. We have had some observations with regard to mechanical teaching and the advantages that the children have gained by learning the meaning of the work and not being expert in the work itself. But, on the whole, then you consider that you ought to have had your promotion in 1909, and you have now arrived at 1913, and you are still without any promotion?—Still without any promotion; and I am teaching in a school with an average for the last quarter of 145, for the same salary as what I had in the country, the same as what I was teaching for seven years ago; at least I might put it in this way, that when I came into town I had got my last increment, but that was for my work in the country.

18465. And since you came into town you have received nothing?—I have received nothing.

18466. You have received no increment at all?—None at all.

18467. The CHAIRMAN.—That is the first year that you are getting any increment?—No, I won't be getting any increment.

18468. You are not getting it yet?—No; because according to the present rule, it would require two more "very goods."

18469. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—So that would be two increments lost that you have not got, that if everything had gone in your favour you would have got?—Yes; according to the present rules I would have lost three £12 and three twenty-four.

18470. You got your increment in 1906?—Yes, I got my last increment.

18471. In 1909, if everything had gone in your favour, you would have got increment then?—Yes £12 per year.

18472. And in 1912, if everything had gone in your favour, you would have a second increment?—Yes.

18473. And now you cannot get an increment until 1915?—According to the present rule, till 1915. I have lost £24 and £28, that is £52.

18474. Mr. HENRY.—In 1906 Mr. Dewar reports, "The instruction is rather mechanical," and then in 1909 Mr. Dewar says, "I am pleased to note that the teaching was of an effective character. Miss Browne gave a very good reading lesson, and the pupils showed facility in imitating her style. Miss Christy taught drawing well to the senior infants, and secured good execution. Drawing was also very carefully taught to the senior pupils by the principal." Now will you tell us, if you please, what change you made in your style of teaching and in the style of teaching of your assistants from Mr. Dewar's visit in 1906 to Mr. Dewar's visit in 1909?—None whatever; we were just teaching exactly on the same principles and on the same lines. We had never altered; we were always striving to improve ourselves, but we made no change whatever in the system on which we were working.

18475. So that the system that was mechanical in 1906 was of an effective character in 1909?—Yes.

2nd July, 1913.]

Mr. JOHN A. GRANT examined.

[Continued.]

18476. Now, if you look to page 8 of your précis, was it in reference to the same examination that Mr. Franklin writes these words, "The written work is generally exceedingly neat, and this school would be marked 'very good' were it not that the written work of the seniors does not reach a satisfactory standard"? Yes; those two statements were made at the same visit.

18477. And, therefore, based on the same materials?—Yes. (Witness hands in Observation Book and Report of Mr. Franklin.)

18478. Now, there is only one other point. When Mr. Dewar came on that appeal visit, as we may call it, did he make any observations at all on the state of proficiency of the pupils or school?—He made some in the Observation Book, but he said to me when he took me out—

18479. Never mind what he said to you, but did he make any official statement either in the Observation Book or in the minutes?—No.

18480. Because this quotation which you give us, "Pay special attention to order and discipline," is not making an observation?—Well, that is all the kind of observation that he made.

18481. Just one other point. When you took charge of that school it was in a very unsatisfactory condition?—Yes.

18482. Are you aware how long a teacher is in a school before he is held responsible for everything in the school—you take charge of a school in a very unsatisfactory state, and an inspector walks in to you on the day you take charge; of course, in that case he cannot hold you responsible for anything that is wrong?—I really never heard when a teacher ought to be supposed to be responsible.

18483. How long do you think yourself it should be before you ought to be fairly held responsible for the state of discipline and order and so on of the pupils?—Mr. Chambers said there was a remarkable change made in six weeks. I believe in one month I had my school in shape.

18484. Ought you not to have twelve months?—Well, it would be much more easy in twelve months.

18485. Would you think it not unreasonable that you should be held responsible for the pupils and the state of order of the school after twelve months?—Not unreasonable.

18486. And, then, would it require the six years you were questioned about to raise the mark from "good" to "very good"?—It would be almost impossible to require six years. If it is to be raised to "good" in twelve months, surely there would be some improvement after that.

18487. Now, as to the conclusion of that six years' period, how many of the original pupils would you find, under normal conditions?—I could scarcely answer.

18488. About how many?—Do you mean the percentage?

18489. What percentage?—Oh, I think there would not be more than 10 per cent. in a city school, especially in my district—a shabby district.

18490. And, therefore, I suppose that your work could not possibly require six years to raise the standard from one of those letters to another?—It would be impossible.

18491. What you mean by saying that it would be impossible is that it would be impossible that such a length of time would be necessary?—Yes; to take six years to change a mark from "good" to "very good" if the teacher had been working; and I had everything to gain by working.

18492. Sir HERMAN WILLIAMS.—That is, you mean that it would be possible to do it in a much shorter time?—Yes; I did it in one year.

18493. Mr. KERR.—You never got any assistance in your teaching from the Observation Book?—Oh, no, sir; no one ever expects to get anything from the Observation Book.

18494. Is that the general attitude of the teachers?—Yes, as far as I know. We never get anything from the Observation Book only little pun-puns.

18495. You do not think education would suffer if the Observation Book was abolished?—If it were wiped out nobody would suffer in the least.

18496. Mr. HARRISON.—You state in your précis that an inspector characterised the school as the worst school in the district, if not the worst in Ireland. I presume that was Mr. Chambers?—Yes, privately, in a letter to me.

18497. You are quite sure of those words?—Yes; they are burned into my memory.

18498. That was in 1906?—Yes; in fact, at the end of 1905.

18499. Now look at the reports on this school given by the same man, Mr. Chambers, in 1903, 1904 and 1905. In 1906 he called the school "good." How do you reconcile that with the other statement—and the next year it certainly dropped to "middling" but it went up again to "fair," which, I presume, is not a condemnatory mark?—Well, it is.

18500. Is it a condemnatory mark?—Well, it is looked upon by teachers as anything lower than "good."

18501. Would a man be justified if he marked a school "fair" saying it was the worst school in his district, if not the worst in Ireland?—It was the conduct of the children attending the school at the time.

18502. What I want to know is, are those words consistent with that report?—Yes, I believe they are.

18503. There is nothing worse than "fair" in that case, I presume, in Ireland?—Well, he said himself that it was one of the worst.

18504. He gave it "fair," and he said it was the worst school in Ireland?—Yes, he said it in a private letter to me regarding the conduct of the pupils.

18505. But, of course, he takes the conduct of the pupils into consideration in his report?—Yes, I know he does.

18506. It struck me that his awarding of "fair" and that remark were absolutely inconsistent, and I want an explanation, if there is one?—I will give the explanation so far as I can—that when I arrived in the school I found the state of the school such that I could not class it as anything else but very bad.

18507. That would not agree with the verdict of "fair"?—But he gave it "fair" on the work after I had been there six weeks.

18508. I am referring to the 1906 report, before you went there, which was "fair"?—The 1905 report was from the examination which was held on the 12th of February, 1906. It is put down that year for the year 1904, but the examination was held in 1906, when I had been in the school six weeks.

18509. Then, as a matter of fact, for 1903 he gave it "fair," 1904 "good," 1905 "middling," and 1906 "fair," so that we may presume that the 1905 merit mark was partly due to your six weeks' work, may we?—Yes; I think it would be reasonable to do so.

18510. But still, the fact remains that a school is quite possibly the worst in Ireland to which he had given "good" two years before?—Yes, he did. I am sorry I have lost that letter, for I kept it for a very long time.

18511. Now you have made this remark, that inspectors take the percentage of passes?—Yes.

18512. Have you any authority for saying that?—Oh, yes.

18513. What?—This year Mr. Kelly showed me his percentages in arithmetic, and he handed it to me.

18514. Percentages of children who got sums right?—Yes, and Mr. Keith.

18515. And that is usual, is it?—As far as every time that questions were given and the marks taken there were percentages taken.

18516. And the teachers expect that to be done?—Well, we would like to see it when he does it. Mr. Kelly showed it to me; that is, he handed it to me after taking the percentages.

18517. And is the same done with regard to passes in reading?—Well, reading is a subject that is confined in which answers are not given on paper. As far as I can see, it is a subject in which certain questions are answered orally, and the inspectors make notes in their own book, and I have never seen percentages of that.

23rd July, 1913.]

Mr. JOHN A. GIBSON examined.

[Continued.]

18518. The CHAIRMAN.—The percentage is taken only on subjects on which the examination is on paper?—Yes, as far as I have seen. As far as I have seen, when the subject is given on paper the percentage is taken. It may be when it is given orally, but I cannot say. I do not know that.

18519. Mr. HARRISON.—As a matter of fact, do the inspectors, if they set tasks, take the papers with which they are working away with them, or do they leave them in the school?—The inspectors take the papers away with them. Mr. Kelly did it; and I may say that Mr. Kelly did so at the examination in my school.

18520. Now you also said that an inspector said to you, "What notice can you expect in a building like this?"—Yes.

18521. Well, I presume, that he was referring to the inconvenience of the premises for teaching, was he not, and also to the overcrowding?—Yes, I believe he was.

18522. Then what that remark really came to was this, that under such unfavourable conditions absolutely first rate results were impossible. I presume he did not mean that he was reducing the mark on account of the premises, but that if your children were overcrowded, and the premises were thoroughly bad and inconvenient for teaching, that state of circumstances would militate against anything like first rate results?

Mr. EDWARD CROWE, Principal of Loughton Boys' School, Galbally, County Limerick, examined.

18523. The CHAIRMAN.—Your school is called Galbally School as well as Loughton?—Yes.

18524. Is it generally called by both names?—Not both officially; but Galbally is the post town, and it is locally called Galbally.

18525. How long have you been in the service of the National Board?—Nearly 26 years; since February, 1888.

18526. How long have you been principal of this school?—Nearly 26 years; 29 next January.

18527. Where were you before that?—In Garrydoole, County Limerick.

18528. So you served under the old results' system?—Yes; from 1888 to 1900 under the old results' system.

18529. What is the average number of your present school?—For the last quarter it was 878.

18530. And what is your grading now?—First of first.

18531. How long have you been that?—Well, I got paper promotion in April, 1909, and paying promotion from October, 1912.

18532. You had to wait a year and a half?—Yes.

18533. So you have got to the very top now?—Yes, with the exception of the increments.

18534. What increments remain for you to get?—There are three increments—one on the 1st of next October and if everything goes right, one every three years from that for the two remaining increments.

18535. And what have been your last three reports?—"Very good," sir. I have the reports here. I have got "very good" since 1906.

18536. Mr. COFFEY.—A succession of "very goods"?—Yes.

18537. The CHAIRMAN.—You have had seven "very goods" since 1906?—Yes; I had no annual inspection in 1912, but the inspection was in February, 1913; February of this year.

18538. I want to ask you a question about that. What happens when a school is not inspected for a year? If in the year before you had "very good" and if in the year following you get "very good," how is the dropped year reckoned?—I do not know how it is reckoned; I do not know how it counts.

18539. The BISHOP or ROSE.—Had you an inspection at the end of the previous year or at the beginning of the year following the dropped year?—Yes, my lord; I will just tell you.

18540. Mr. COFFEY.—It was some time in November?—On the 28th November, 1911.

—Yes, I think he meant that generally; but I said to him that it was unfair to hold me accountable for this.

18541. If that was so then he might have made a difference between your personal merit and the merit mark of the school?—Yes, he might have.

18542. But if the results produced were only "good" he could not call the school "very good," because the premises were bad. You would not expect him to do that?—But if that had been taken into consideration in my favour he might have been able to award.

18543. Mr. KERR.—Did you ever get your personal mark?—I never got it.

18544. Mr. HARRISON.—That would be very fair for the personal merit mark, but it would be a different thing as regards the school. If an inspector came in and said, "These are abominable premises, and, therefore, I will give as a merit mark 'very good,' though on exactly the same results in another school I would only give it as 'good,'" You would not expect that?—The Board said that it was to be taken into consideration in our favour.

18545. The CHAIRMAN.—Adverse circumstances?—Adverse circumstances. My various managers appealed to Dr. Sturges on the same point, and I got no redress. It was not taken into consideration in my case at all.

18546. Mr. HENLY.—Had a complete school year elapsed without an inspection of the school—your school year is from July to July?—Yes.

18547. Mr. COFFEY.—Was not your school examined in February of this year?—Yes, the 28th.

18548. Then you had an inspection within the school year?—Yes, there was an inspection within the school year, but not during the calendar year 1912.

18549. Of course, you had an inspection on the 28th of November, 1911, and an inspection in February, 1913?—Yes.

18550. Is not that so?—Yes; therefore, no school year elapsed without an inspection.

18551. The BISHOP or ROSE.—The first was for 1911—2 and the second was 1912—13?—Yes.

18552. The CHAIRMAN.—Who are your inspectors in that circuit?—Mr. Welby is the senior and Mr. Fitzgerald is the district.

18553. Is he your district inspector?—Well, he has been once on an incidental visit at my school, but he merely came in and went out again.

18554. Who inspects you regularly?—Mr. Welby was the last; in fact, for the last seven inspections I had six different inspectors (I mean the annual inspections).

18555. Where would they come from?—Chiefly in the headquarters for our district, and they come from Central.

18556. And they have been changed so often as that?—Yes, I have a list of them here.

18557. Do you complain of changes?—Yes, frequent changes. Different inspectors adopt different standards of appraising the work done in the school, and each inspector tries to stereotype his particular standard. As there is frequent change of inspectors, and as the teachers attempt to please each new master with a view to obtaining a favourable merit mark, with its consequent promotion or increment, all initiative and individuality have been destroyed, and the teachers, in their attempt at conformity to every new fad, have been turned into mere automatons, to the detriment of the pupils and of education generally.

18558. Would you illustrate that by a concrete example in your own experience?—I have a concrete example further on. In illustration of this variety of requirements on the part of different inspectors, I might mention that three successive inspectors, whom I shall designate A, B, and C, were entirely at variance regarding their methods of teaching and testing reading in my school. A asked me how I taught reading, and I showed him Strad's Review of Reviews,

22nd July, 1913.]

Mr. EDWARD CROWE examined.

[Continued.]

T. P.'s Weekly, and Pearson's Magazine, and told him I wanted of these and the daily paper, in addition to the books in the school library (about 200 volumes), as aids in the teaching of reading, as well as geography and composition sometimes. He strongly approved of my method after he had heard the senior pupils read. B, his successor, came to my school for the first time, and in the course of his inspection asked me to get the senior pupils to read—he had then been in the school for a considerable time without my knowing who or what he was. That day's Independent was lying on the rostrum, and I took it up, whereupon he asked what I wanted it for. My reply was to get the boys to read it. He said I was breaching one of the Board's rules, to which I pleaded ignorance, and asked him to mention the particular rule. He replied that newspapers were not sanctioned by the Commissioners. I tried to explain that neither were library books, and that I always understood a public library to include the daily paper or papers, if more than one were available. My explanation was cut short by the inspector saying he would not discuss the matter, but that I should not in future bring newspapers into the school, and when he had gone I found a note to that effect in my Observation Book. C, the next inspector, tested my sixth and seventh standards' boys in reading by giving them cuttings from newspapers and magazines to read.

18597a. Mr. CORRY.—If you had given up the newspapers there would have been no difficulty. Possibly. One account given by Inspector C— I thought particularly difficult, being taken from a review of a book on "Impressions on the Balkan Peninsula," written by an English tourist. This I gathered from hearing the boys read it. The inspector criticised the other boys in the class on the matter read, and stated that they appeared slow in following the reader. I told him I thought the subject a very difficult one, and that I would not complain if he had given them a narrative or descriptive piece; but that my impression was reviewing a book was a difficult matter, even for experienced literateurs, and if the reviewer experienced a difficulty, the understanding of such review was much more difficult, especially for school-boys. Some inspectors come into the school apparently with the object of fault-finding, and not with a view to aiding the teacher in any way. For example—On October 2nd, 1911, a junior inspector spent from 3.15 to 3.45 in my school, and found fault with everything he saw during his visit.

18597b. Who was that junior inspector?—Mr. Dardis, and he left behind him a full page of adverse remarks in my Observation Book. This was signed by the senior inspector, who accompanied him, but who went to the girls' school and came into my school just as the junior inspector was writing his report in my Observation Book.

18598. Who was the senior?—Mr. Welpy.

18599. The CHAIRMAN.—Does that mean that the senior was in the girls' school while the junior inspector was inspecting your school?—Yes, exactly.

18599. All the time?—Yes.

18599. And then the senior only came into your school on the junior was leaving?—Yes, a short time before he left.

18599. And the senior left without making any examination at all?—Yes, he did. And as a result of this visit my manager received a private letter from the senior inspector.

18599. Mr. CORRY.—How long was Mr. Welpy in the boys' school that evening?—Well, I should think about ten or fifteen minutes, and he and Mr. Dardis were at the rostrum during all that time. The first question he asked Mr. Dardis when he came in was if he had written or made his report, and the two went up to the rostrum, and the report was written. Mr. Dardis wrote the report and Mr. Welpy signed it.

18599. The CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Welpy was standing by when he was writing in the Observation Book?—Yes, he was. As a result of this visit, my manager received a private letter from the senior inspector

containing the following statement:—"That he regretted to find such negligence in a seemingly good school." This was followed up on November 1st by an official memo, to the manager containing an extract from the senior inspector's report, and reprimanding the two assistants and myself for not having any preparation for work, while some of our prepared notes were lying on the windows beside the respective teachers, and others had been seen by the inspector. I was also reprimanded for neglecting a monitor who was only appointed the previous July, with five weeks' holidays intervening.

18600. What report did you get for the year that you got the reprimand?—I got a "very good" from the senior inspector that year. I was doubly reprimanded on the 1st of November, and I got a "very good" report from Mr. Welpy on the 28th of November. My copy of the time-table furnished to the inspector was brought back to me sealed in the most objectionable manner by this inspector.

18600. What time?—On that occasion. He brought back the time-table in his bag. I had posted it to him a short time previously. That is one of our rules. I posted it to the inspector, and on that occasion he brought it back in his bag, and I was led to believe that I was utterly incapable of organising my school, notwithstanding that I had been promoted to the first division of first grade (paper promotion) in April, 1909, and had got real promotion in October, 1910, just one year previously.

18601. And that occurred after you had got this high promotion?—Yes.

18602. Did he actually say that you were utterly incapable?—Well, I do not say that he said it, but I infer it.

18603. I want to find out on what you founded that inference, that he regards you as incapable of organising?—I took that inference from the remark that appears in my time table, that it was very defective and very much needed improvement and a great deal of amendment, and from the wording that appears in the time-table, it might be inferred that I was not able to draw up a time-table; and if a teacher is not able to draw up a time-table, I do not think he is able to organise a school.

18604. And it is founded chiefly on your time-table?—Yes. On November 10th, I replied to this memo. through the manager, with the result that I got from him an official memo, bearing date January 16th, 1912, stating:—"The Commissioners found no reason to alter their previous decision." Meantime, on November 28th, 1911, the senior inspector held the annual inspection in my school, and his report, which I received on February 7th, 1912, was a "very good." It stated that "the principal renders very good service, and the assistants' work is good on the whole." The monitor whom I was charged with neglecting in October, 1911, was tested in his special course, in April, 1912, by the senior inspector, and the note left in my Observation Book states that he was well prepared. It seems strange that I was doubly reprimanded and on the borders of inefficiency in October, 1911, while in November of same year I was rendering very good service. This is an enigma I am unable to solve.

18605. You mention in your précis the withdrawal of an assistant's increment through an adverse report on the third year of the incremental period?—Yes; I have a written statement from my assistant bearing on that. He is one of the assistants in the school. Shall I read it?

18606. Yes, please?—This is the statement:—"I was appointed assistant in this school in September, 1908, after having finished my training course in De La Salle Training College in the July of that year. I had charge of the third and fourth standards and the singing of all the school until the annual inspection of 1908, when, upon the recommendation of the senior and district inspectors, the principal changed the system of organisation so as to give improved facilities for the training of infants. I was then put in charge of the junior section (which includes infants, first and second), and the singing and drill of the whole school. The principal and myself went to considerable trouble and expense to provide dual desks

23rd July, 1912.]

Mr. EMMETT COWEN examined.

[Continued.]

of the best pattern, as well as kindergarten materials, plasticine modelling outfit, and other incidentals necessary for the proper training of infants. I studied very carefully the most up-to-date methods of infant teaching, and made a most earnest effort to train my class in the best manner possible."

18573. You paid for them out of your own pocket?—No, we did not, but we organised an entertainment to get funds. We raised the money by means of an entertainment got up in the school, and with the funds so raised got all the materials necessary for the kindergarten. "I received my first increment at the end of 1906, and I expected to get the second increment in 1907, as would be usual. However, though the merit mark of the school, as a result of the 1906 examination, remained at "very good," I was deprived of my increment. I did not get it until 1910. Why I was deprived of a year's increment of £7 I do not know, nor have I since found out. I was equally zealous during those three years as I was during my first increment term, and except a few minor faults, I have seen nothing to warrant its withdrawal. There has been no lowering of the "very good" merit mark since 1906. The only structures on my work during the three years of my second increment period—1907, 1908, 1909—are those contained in the observation book after the 1909 annual examination, and they are not of any great importance. They are—(a) That the discipline of infants is weak. (b) A remark as to the reading of first standard, to wit, "That it is not accurate enough."

18574. Mr. COWEN.—That refers to one of your assistants?—This is my second assistant. He lost his increment the final year.

18575. Has he any explanation to offer, because there seems to be no reason at all why he was deprived of it, seeing that the school got "very good"?—Yes, the school got "very good" that year.

18576. Mr. HENLY.—Was there an application made for it?—Oh, yes, application was made for it.

18577. The CHAIRMAN.—You have read observations (a) and (b), that the discipline of the infants was weak and the reading of the first standard not accurate enough. What is the third?—There is no third; there are only two. Then the statement goes on: "With regard to the discipline of the infants. I hold, as I then told the inspector who made the observation, that if infants be subjected to severe disciplinary measures, their mental growth will be retarded, and this view is held by all educationists, from Froebel to Dottorena Montessori. The following took place with reference to the note on the reading of first standard:—The inspector who made the note examined the same standard the next day, on his visiting the girls' school, at my request. He found occasion to alter his judgment, and accordingly altered his note in the observation book for the better. Strange that a perceptible improvement could have been effected in one day. It must have been on the private report of that annual examination in 1909 I was deprived of a year's increment because in the observation book and annual examination reports of 1907 and 1908 no fault of any kind is mentioned."

18578. Who made that report for 1908?—Mr. Cole. Mr. O'Brien concludes his statement as follows:—"How I, who held a third of the school under my charge, could have been inefficient enough to have been deprived of an increment while the merit mark of the whole school was 'very good' is more than I can understand. I certainly consider I have been harshly and unjustly treated, and I fail to see any reason why I should have been so penalised."

18579. Mr. HENLY.—The inspector made some notings and he accordingly altered the notes?—Oh, yes, there is an alteration of Mr. Cole's notings in the observation book. I have the observation book with me. (Witness hands in observation book.)

18580. The CHAIRMAN.—The noting was this originally—"Reading continues to be hazy in first standard: it is halting and inaccurate; in the third and fourth it is not distinct enough." As it is changed it is—"Reading continues to be indistinct in first

standard; it is halting and not accurate enough; in third and fourth it is not distinct enough." He makes it milder, "Not accurate enough." Instead of "inaccurate."—"And "indistinct" instead of "hazy." He makes another alteration here. He complained in the first of one of the assistants coming in late. He said he did not arrive until a few minutes after him, and he made it, "First assistant teacher arrived just after me." He had "a few minutes" down first, and he altered that to "just after me."

18581. The BANNER OF ROSE.—Was it at the request of Mr. O'Brien, the assistant teacher, that the inspector went out to examine the first class in the boys' school?—Yes, my lord.

18582. Is that what the statement is intended to convey?—Yes. On the first day he inspected our school, but on the second day he inspected the girls' school.

18583. I am afraid the statement here is rather ambiguous. It is this—"The inspector who made the note examined the same standard the next day on his visiting the girls' school at my request."—If you put in "at my request" after "examined" it would be quite clear. At the request of the assistant on the day that the inspector inspected the girls' school he came into our school and re-examined the first class reading, that is he re-examined Mr. O'Brien's class.

18584. Mr. COWEN.—You had "very good" from 1907?—From 1906. I think there was no "very good" in 1905.

18585. They began in 1906?—Yes, so I believe. Here is Mr. Browne's report for 1906:—"I have the report favourably on that state of this school. It is being carefully and intelligently conducted. Sixth and seventh standards were exceptionally good. All the staff deserve praise. Singing is well taught by Mr. O'Brien." In 1907 Mr. Browne again says:—"The instruction is well managed." Mr. McEnery in 1908:—"The instruction of the pupils is intelligent."

18586. That was a very good report too?—That was a very good report.

18587. The CHAIRMAN.—That was for 1908?—Yes. Then 1909, the year Mr. O'Brien was deprived of his increment, Mr. Cole gave "very good" also. (Reads Note.)

18588. The BANNER OF ROSE.—Is not that a little stronger than in Mr. O'Brien's paper?—Mr. O'Brien says he took exception to the reading of the infants.

18589. I think it is a little stronger?—Yes, a little.

18590. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, 1910?—In 1910 Mr. Fitzpatrick gave "very good." He says:—"This school is conducted with ability." In 1911 Mr. Welply notes:—"The principal readers very good service, and the assistants' work is good on the whole. Grammar needs more attention. There should be more taste and expression in reading, and better results should be attained in singing. Mr. O'Brien should teach arithmetic better."

18591. Mr. COWEN.—That was "very good" also?—"Very good" also. There was no inspection for 1912. Then for 1913 Mr. P. J. Fitzgerald gave "very good" also. He says:—"The principal is a very capable teacher, and the assistants are earnest and do good work. Proficiency in the subjects in which tests were applied is in general not better than 'good.' This is in no doubt largely due to the irregular attendance of pupils for the last six weeks owing to an epidemic in the school district. The school was recovered under normal conditions." I may mention that the inspection was held on the 5th of February, and we had an epidemic of whooping-cough, owing to which the school has been closed. We had scarcely any attendance during December, and we only re-opened towards the end of January, and the inspection was on the 5th of February.

18592. And then you got "very good"?—And we still got "very good."

22nd July, 1911.]

Mr. EDMOND CROWE examined.

[Continued.]

1890. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, as to improvements?—This is the letter which the manager got from the Education Office, dated the 1st of November, 1911.—

“OFFICE OF NATIONAL EDUCATION,
“Dublin, 1st November, 1911.

“Lewtown Boys' School.

“Rev. Bro.,—I am directed by the Commissioners of National Education to quote for your information the following extracts from the Senior Inspector's report of his visit to the above-named school on the 2nd ult.:—“Very little work is displayed on the keeping of the school and premises. The school-room to-day was not quite clean, and too many scraps of paper are allowed to lie on the floor. The out-offices are dirty, and they need repairs, plastering, etc. No member of the school staff had any preparation for work. The Assistant in charge of Standard V. (Mr. Reilly) had not even his class-book annotated since the beginning of the school year. His method of teaching reading is very faulty, and the explanation of subject-matter is very poor. The Monitor (John Ryan), appointed 1st July, 1911, has not given a criticism lesson yet, though the school has been in operation for seven weeks since that date. The Monitor makes no preparation for teaching his classes; he was engaged teaching to-day (1.30 to 2) when he should have been at private study. The Composition, Penmanship, and Spelling of Third Standard are very poor (Principal). Reading and Mental Arithmetic are unsatisfactory in Fifth Standard (Mr. Reilly). Discipline is lax, and the pupils compare unfavourably with those of the girls' school in personal neatness and in manners. I am to request you to be good enough to reprimand the teachers for their neglect of preparation, and in particular to reprimand the principal teacher, Mr. Crowe, for his neglect to train the monitor.—I am, very Rev. Sir, your obedient servant, W. J. DUNNE, Secretary.”

My explanation in reply to that was sent through the manager on the 10th of November:—

“Vicar Rev. Bro.,—With reference to the official memo. re above school, received by you on the 2nd inst., I beg to offer the following remarks:—The memo. purports to be an extract from the Senior Inspector's report of his visit to this school on the 2nd ult., while the Senior Inspector spent at the outside not more than fifteen minutes at the school, and was during most of that time in consultation with Mr. Dardis, Junior Inspector, whose visit extended from 2.15 to 3.45, and who was then writing his report in the observation book, which report the Senior Inspector endorsed. The statement, “That no member of the school staff had any preparation for work,” is not in accordance with fact, as the following will clearly show. When Mr. Dardis arrived the senior pupils were employed writing a composition on a Nature Study Lesson, on leaves and their classification and functions, given by me the previous day, and I had in my hands specimens of the leaves which they were drawing at the time. I had also outlines of these leaves, showing their variations in form and position, on short drawn on the blackboard in front of the pupils, and was directing their attention to the leaves and sketches when Mr. Dardis entered the room. These leaves I held in my hand until the end of the lesson, and Mr. Dardis could not help seeing them. I had also a notebook, in which I had jotted down much notes of the work that I was doing, laid on the window beside me. Had Mr. Dardis asked for this I should have been only too pleased to produce it. He merely asked if I had drawn up a syllabus of my Nature Study work, and when I showed him a notebook, with notes covering my course of Nature Study last August in the College of Science and Glenside, and said I meant to adhere as closely as I could to this course, he made no remarks whatever. History was also a subject for that day, and Mr. Dardis saw my book on the subject, with margin annotations and questions appropriate to each chapter. This book was not asked for by Mr. Dardis, but its production was the result of a remark I overheard

him making to Mr. Reilly, Senior Assistant, to the effect that, so far as he had seen, the teaching of history in the country schools consisted in telling the children all about the Picts and De Danians. I challenged this statement, said it was unfair to the country teachers, and in proof of my contention produced the text-book I was using to the senior pupils. I had also the other books I was using annotated, and so had the assistants, but Mr. Reilly states that his library reader was mislaid some days previously, and so he had to procure another. He teaches History to Third and Fourth Standards, and Mr. Dardis, in my presence, found fault with the annotations in his book as being too copious. With the exception of a Nature Study Syllabus, the only records of work asked for by Mr. Dardis were a Progress Record and Weekly Syllabus. The latter has been discarded on the suggestion of Mr. Wdely, Senior Inspector, and I explained that the former was not written up, because having had vacation from the 14th July to the 29th August, September was the first month during which really effective work had been done, and as this month had terminated on the previous school day (Friday), we were only one day in arrears. Having been at the Rural Science Course last summer, I was unable to return to school before the 4th September, and during the remainder of that month I was instructing the monitor, who was appointed the previous July, into his work, and had given him no special class, which accounts for his not having prepared notes for teaching. For the same reason, his two criticism lessons for September were omitted, but he had one prepared for the previous Wednesday (his criticism lesson day). Owing, however, to the very wet morning, the children who arrived in time for the lesson were in such a drenched condition that I permitted them to run about to keep up the heat of their bodies till their clothes were partially dry. It would be positive cruelty to keep them sitting for half-an-hour in the condition they were in. This I explained to Mr. Dardis, and the school records will bear out my statement. The monitor was, and is, still teaching from 1.30 to 2, as I had offered him time for teaching, but forgot to note it in the copy of the Time Table furnished to the Inspector. I could have explained this to Mr. Dardis had he condescended to ask me, but he preferred questioning the monitor privately. On looking over Mr. Dardis's report in my observation book, I find the only reference he made to third standard (one of my special classes) is that more attention should be paid to their writing. Apparently, spelling and composition were afterwards. You have seen the writing of this standard, and will, I think, admit that it compares favourably with the writing in any other section of the school, or with that of children of similar standing in any other school. No spelling test was applied by the Inspector, and as these children had just begun to express their thoughts on paper, the standard of proficiency in their compositions could not be very high. In fact, were I a free agent, I would allow children to give free expression to their ideas with very little correction, for none at least, as all educationalists agree, that nothing discourages beginners so much as to see their criticisms scored and disfigured by those whom they regard as critics. Mr. Reilly stated to me that he thought the pupils of standard V. were slow in answering questions in mental arithmetic, but when he taxed them about it afterwards they told him they could not catch what Mr. Dardis said. Mr. Reilly also complained of Mr. Dardis's hounding methods (addressing such remarks to the boys as “hurry up, you ought to have found it out now,” almost immediately he had put his question, preventing thereby concentration of thought. With the statement in the memo., referring to the superiority of the girls here over the boys in refined manners and personal neatness, I have no quarrel as it is a plain admission of general application, which has earned for the ladies the title of the gentle sex. However, manners are like malades, most people have some of them, but few have all. Even inspectors, if subjected to strict censorship, might not be found above reproach. For example, on more than one occasion recently inspectors on their first visit to this school forgot to

22nd July, 1913.]

Mr. EDMOND CROWE examined.

[Continued.]

introduce themselves, and I was compelled to ask if they were inspectors. Possibly they reserve such amenities for their own social circle, and consider them superfluous in their intercourse with teachers. The contrasting references to the boys and girls I leave to the taste and breadth of outlook of the writer, and I leave you to judge the lengths to which a hostile inspector can go when seeking for faults. I use the word hostile, because from his conduct and actions during his visit I am reluctantly forced to the conclusion that Mr. Dardie came into this school with a prejudiced mind, and is being his first visit, the process of examination leaves only one reason for his hostility, which is that, as Chairman of the Tipperary Teachers' Association, I, last July, was one of the signatories to a memorial of complaint on behalf of the teachers of the District 18 against Mr. Welby, Senior Inspector, who accompanied Mr. Dardie, but spent most of his time in the girls' school. I spent about a month of my holidays last summer to the study of Rural Science, and, if called, I mean to do likewise next summer, and only a fortnight ago I cycled to Tipperary, a distance of ten miles, to attend a lecture on Drawing given by Mr. McIlwaine. In these there any indication of flagging and needing a reprimand? This school has got a succession of "very good" reports from four different inspectors, on the strength of which I was recently promoted to First Division of First Grade. From the foregoing you can judge what a happy lot is that of the teacher who, to paraphrase one of Dr. Horlick's famous phrases, constantly carries about with him the consciousness of the criminal awaiting his trial, and, as an educationist of long experience, you can appreciate the difficulty of discharging the onerous duties to pupils and the State imposed upon the teacher under such trying and work-killing conditions."

Then there came this reply from the Office, dated January 16th:—

"Rev. Sir,—With reference to your communication of the 14th November last, forwarding a letter from the Principal Teacher of the above-named school, regarding the Inspector's report furnished in connection with their visit to the school on the 22d October, I am directed by the Commissioners of National Education to inform you, that having considered your representations, and those of the Principal Teacher, in connection with further reports from the Inspectors concerned, they see no reason for modifying their decision with regard to the Teachers so commemoated to you in their letter of the 1st November, 1911. I am to add that the Commissioners consider that the suggestion of the Principal, that the Inspectors were hostile and prejudiced towards him, is wholly unwarranted.—I am, very Rev. Sir, your obedient servant, W. J. DUNWORTH, Secretary."

The visit in connection with which the collective reprimand was issued on the 1st of November, 1911, was made on the 2nd of October, 1911. My reply was received in the Education Office on the 14th November. On the 28th November, Mr. Welby, Senior Inspector, held the annual inspection, and after an exhaustive and searching examination, extending from 10 a.m. to 3.15 p.m., reported the school as a very good one. He examined the monitor in his special course on the 18th of the following April from 9.30 to 1.0, and stated he was well prepared. I have copies of both reports.

18294. Mr. HENRY.—You said different inspectors had different standards for appraising the work of the school, and then you went on to state that frequent changes of inspectors were detrimental to education. Is that right?—Well, as I have said, each one has a standard of his own, and he finds fault with the method adopted by his predecessor, and if the teacher does not fall into line with him, no matter what the teacher's own ideas may be, he is bound to suffer, whereas if you fall into line with the inspector's ideas you get on very well.

18295. So that you think that under the present system the teacher is compelled to study what you call the fads of the inspector, and teach in accordance with them?—Oh, undoubtedly. If he does not he suffers.

18296. And that this is the only way in which he can get his increment or promotion in due course?—The only way.

18297. That is what you mean by saying that all initiative and individuality have been destroyed?—Yes.

18298. Do you think that is good for the education of the pupils?—Well, I do not think so. I think if you have not individually in the teacher you will scarcely have it in the pupil.

18299. Is it likely to check or damp the enthusiasm of the teacher?—Oh, I think it is, in this way, that if the teacher gets his ideas ready made from the inspector he is not going to think out ideas of his own, especially when he knows that it may mean a loss of money to him.

18300. Now, with respect to the criticism of one of these inspectors on the teaching of reading, were you acting within the rules of the Commissioners, or the spirit of the rules, in introducing a newspaper for the pupils to read?—Well, I do not know of any rule against that. Of course, the Commission say politics must be excluded from the schools but you can use a newspaper without introducing politics. Besides no sensible person takes his politics from newspapers. We have also a library in the school, run by the boys themselves, and there are over 300 volumes in that library, and I had taken library books previous to that at the reading lessons. If there was some book that I thought worth taking out I would take it—a passage which struck me as worth reading, and get the boys to read it with the object of giving them an interest in the book.

18301. Well, in Rule 129 they say no book can be used for the purpose for unified secular instruction to which a reasonable objection might be entertained on religious or political grounds, and subject to that the manager may select the books, but they require to submit annually, for examination by the inspector, a list of proposed books not later than one month prior to the commencement of the school year?—Yes, we send on this list; we always send on a list of the books that we use, the readers and arithmetic and exercise books for writing.

18302. Of course, you are aware, Mr. Crowe, that the tendency liberality of the National Board has been to allow a much wider selection of books than they used to allow?—I understood that.

18303. And, therefore, I fancy that you presumed you were at liberty to introduce a newspaper for testing the pupils?—Yes, sir.

18304. But did you use the newspaper as a class-book?—Oh, not as a class-book. Of course, they had class-books and they had story readers also.

18305. You only used it occasionally to test whether they could read at night?—I used the newspaper as an occasional reader, also as a means of teaching geography, and sometimes as a means of teaching composition, and on that particular occasion Parliament had just reopened after the dissolution. The address from the Throne was in that issue, and that was a thing that I wanted the children to read (the senior boys), as I thought I might be able to give them an idea of the constitution under which they live; I had been in Westminster on several occasions, and I thought I could give them an idea of how they got on there, which information might be useful to them, or at least interesting.

18306. When Mr. Dardie visited your school on the 22d of October, 1911, what was his standing as an inspector?—I could not really say. He might be a probationer for all I know.

18307. You knew he was not long in the service?—I do not think he was. Now, how many "very good" did you get before Mr. Dardie's visit?—From 1906 to 1910 inclusive, five.

18308. So that you have got sufficient evidence to satisfy any reasonable person that you were an efficient teacher and conducted your school successfully?—Well, I had satisfied previous inspectors up to that time. I had satisfied Mr. Browne and Mr. McHenry, and others.

18309. Mr. CURRY.—You had satisfied all the inspectors up to them?—Yes.

18310. Mr. HENRY.—And then this junior inspector coming in to you for the first time found fault with everything he saw during his visit?—Yes, sir, everything he saw; he was not pleased with anything.

18311. And, therefore, he was finding fault with work and methods which had given satisfaction to inspectors for a number of years previously?—Yes, sir, he was.

18312. And he had had very little experience as an inspector?—Well, Mr. Welby admitted to me after

2nd July, 1913.]

Mr. ROBERT CHOWS examined.

[Continued.]

were that mine was the first school he allowed him to inspect. He admitted that on a fair day when he came and the school was not working.

18918. The CHAIRMAN.—Was that in the first year after probation?—Mr. WELBY admitted that on a day when he had a fair and he came to the school. We had a fair on that particular day, and Mr. Welby came along and he found the school not working, but I happened to be in the school. He called for the observation book, and the first thing he saw in it was Mr. Darda's, to the effect that the writer found no preparation for work. He asked me how that came there, and I said I would be inclined to ask him that question. I said I did not know, and he said, "Mr. Darda ought to be able to inspect the school, but as a matter of fact, you are the first I allowed him to inspect."

18919. Mr. HENRY.—You state, as a matter of fact, that both you and your associates had made ample preparation for work?—Yes, sir, we had.

18920. And he made no inquiry from you?—He actually saw the book. (Witness produces book.) I told him I went on that, and Mr. Welby says it also. That is my book of notes.

18921. Had the assistants also made preparation?—Yes, they had.

18922. Did he ask each one of them to produce his notes?—He asked me for no preparation whatever, but that book was lying on the desk. He asked me had I a syllabus of work drawn up, a syllabus of my Nature work, and I showed him this book, and it was lying on the desk when Mr. Welby came in.

18923. In the face of that report you got a reprimand?—And doubly reprimanded.

18924. You got a reprimand?—Yes, sir.

18925. Were you called on for any explanation with reference to the adverse report before the reprimand was issued?—None whatever.

18926. The report went up?—The report went up and the reprimand came down.

18927. The report was inaccurate according to your statement?—Yes.

18928. And on that inaccurate report you got a reprimand?—Yes.

18929. A teacher of your standing gets a reprimand on an inaccurate report of a very junior inspector?—Yes, sir. I got no opportunity at all of controverting the statements made by him.

18930. Now, this monitor that was referred to was appointed in July?—Yes.

18931. What was your particular neglect as far as that monitor was concerned?—He said that the monitor had no prepared notes for his work. As a matter of fact, I had given the monitor no work at all to do. We gave holidays on the 11th of July, and I was on a science course, and did not get back to my school until the 4th of September. During the remainder of September I was instituting him into his work, and I gave him no class to teach, as he was not fit to teach any class, and as he had no class to teach I did not see the necessity of having prepared notes. He was merely a schoolboy up to then.

18932. What was the rule with regard to the amount of teaching that a monitor must do?—Two hours' instruction and two hours' teaching.

18933. Look at Rule 137?—Oh, yes, about his qualification and salary and period of service.

18934. Will you read as to the amount of teaching work he must do—a monitor must not be employed in teaching for more than two hours in each day during his period of service?—Yes, two hours.

18935. No, no, it is not two hours, but the rule is imperative that you are not to employ the monitor for more than two hours. Is not that so?—Yes.

18936. But it does not give any minimum time—you need not necessarily employ him for two hours. Is not that so?—Yes, sir.

18937. And, therefore, in this particular case you were taking this monitor and training him, or, as you say yourself, instituting him into the work, and therefore you were not violating the rule?—No, since he had no teaching.

18938. You were not neglecting the monitor?—I was not.

18939. And therefore the reprimand that came for neglecting that monitor was one that you did not deserve?—Yes.

18940. The object of this rule was that he was not to teach more than two hours, and you say he never taught at all. Of course, you know that the tendency amongst teachers is to make the monitor teach all day long if there was not such a rule, and you were doing the very best thing for the monitor?—As a matter of fact, he often would have only an hour's teaching afterwards, as we have a good staff, and I have not much faith in monitors, for the first year, at all events.

18941. And in spite of that reprimand you got "very good"?—I got "very good" in November.

18942. And the same man you were reported as neglecting was reported on as being very well prepared?—Yes.

18943. And would you be in favour of your pupils being tested by examination or tested by inspection?—Well, I think, in my opinion, a combination of the two would be the most desirable.

18944. Do you think it would be desirable that each school should have a school year of its own, or that they should all have a uniform school year as at present?—Well, I think of there is to be examination there ought to be a school year for each school, and that the examination should be held as nearly as possible about the end of the year in order to do justice to teacher and pupils.

18945. Under the present system, supposing you were to have a combination of the systems of inspection and examination, would you be in favour of each having its own school year?—I think each school ought to have a school year of its own. That is my opinion.

18946. Do you think the teacher ought to get notice under those circumstances of the general inspection?—I think so; I think he ought, otherwise some of his best pupils may be away.

18947. What is the rule in your part of the world with regard to the notice issued?—There is no notice of any kind. An inspector comes in and he goes to work. Sometimes he looks on at the teacher for some time, and then he starts examining and makes a most exhaustive examination sometimes. For instance, that inspection that Mr. Welby made, I would not call an inspection at all, but an examination.

18948. Mr. Welby does not examine minutely?—Oh, yes, Mr. Welby makes a most minute examination. At least that was my experience.

18949. The CHAIRMAN.—A very detailed examination?—I would say that he makes a very detailed examination; he goes into every subject and takes the greater number of the pupils.

18950. Mr. HENRY.—Do you think it is fair to judge a teacher's work by examination of pupils, some of whom may have attended only a few days?—Oh, I think it is not fair at all; I think it is most unreasonable.

18951. Does he discriminate between those who attend regularly and irregularly?—I think he takes them indiscriminately; he makes no distinction whatever. He had no record of the pupils' attendances while examining.

18952. Have you any suggestion to make as to this question of the needless issue of reprimands—as to how that should be dealt with?—I do not think a teacher should be reprimanded unless he is consistently negligent, unless he consistently neglects his duty.

18953. Do you think the teacher's general character should be taken into consideration if an inspector calls attention to minor faults?—Oh, I think so. I think it has a very injurious effect on a teacher who has been a successful teacher. He is not inclined to put his heart into the work if you dishearten him, and he feels that any day he may be declared inefficient, even though a month before that he may be mentioned as doing very good work. It takes the spirit of the teacher out of his work.

18954. The CHAIRMAN.—You were never asked for any explanation by the Board?—Oh, none whatever, sir.

18955. Mr. HENRY.—Is there much dissatisfaction at this present time in your part of the country?—Oh, I am quite certain there is.

18956. How far do you think it exists?—Oh, I think it is almost general in the district.

18957. Will you tell us what is the cause of this discontent, as far as you know?—I think it is the harsh

22nd July, 1938.]

Mr. EDWARD GROW examined.

[Continued.]

ness of the inspection, and the indifference with which the inspectors treat the teachers; that they do not mind the feelings of the teachers, and have the stiffest reasons for recommending and admonishing.

18633. It is not the inspector who recommends.—No, but I think it amounts to that; it looks like that, at all events.

18634. You think there is a want of sympathy between the inspectors and the teachers?—There is no sympathy whatever. Latterly the tendency on the part of the inspector appears to be to treat the teacher as an inferior being altogether.

18635. And there is a want of sympathetic administration in the office?—Yes, I think the office is inclined to believe anything that an inspector would send in about the teachers. I think they are inclined to believe the worst of a teacher, as far as I can see.

18636. Mr. HARRISON.—There are only one or two questions I have to ask you. How many visits had you from Mr. Dardis?—Only one.

18637. Did I understand that Mr. Welby signed or countermanded his observations?—No, Sir.

18638. So that practically Mr. Welby, I suppose, made himself responsible for them?—Well it came back to my manager as an extract from the senior inspector's report. That was the wording of it, as you will see from the actual document that I have here.

18639. It was not until some time afterwards, on a subsequent visit apparently, that Mr. Welby told you that this was the first time that Mr. Dardis had been entrusted with the sole inspection of a school?—Yes, on the 12th of December following.

18640. Now, have you any reason to suppose that Mr. Welby recommended a reprimand on that report?—Well, of course, I have no evidence to prove that he recommended it.

18641. But it is possible that the reprimand may have been given by one of the secretaries or examiners?—Oh, yes, as far as I am aware.

18642. And without any reference to him?—Quite possibly; I am not aware; I do not know.

18643. And about that time I believe you complained very much of the criticism of the time table. Who was it that criticised?—Mr. Dardis.

18644. Was it Mr. Dardis who made these notes?—Oh, yes, Sir; all this is the work of Mr. Dardis.

18645. He explained to you what it was that he objected to?—No explanation whatever. He brought back this time table with all this coming on it.

18646. Did you understand what he objected to?—I did not. In some cases I did, and in others I did not. Of course, I do not claim perfection for that time table; but it is the way it has been treated that I complain of—the manner in which it has been illuminated.

18647. This is not a usual practice of inspectors?—No, Sir, it is not. I have never seen it before.

18648. In the ordinary way he would strike out certain things that he thought might be struck out?—Yes, we had been accustomed to that.

18649. And you are quite sure that this is Mr. Dardis's?—Oh, yes, his initials are on it, "C.P.D., 30/9/11."

18650. These are his initials?—Yes, and this is his work; and I might add that part of the history time was given to reading in addition to the reading lesson proper.

18651. In this time table it would strike me, applying the English standard that you were giving an undue amount of time to subjects such as arithmetic, and that you were giving too little time to singing in some of the classes, and too little time to reading in the upper classes?—Well, I had improved on that, and had put every reading instead of mental arithmetic between the sending of the time table and getting it back.

18652. And I should have thought 80 minutes was too short a time in the week for drill if it was to be effective?—Well, that 80 minutes' drill means special drill for half an hour. They have also games during recreation time, and nearly all those boys are country boys, some of whom have to travel two and three miles to school, so they have no lack of healthy exercise.

18653. Then I may take it that your objection was not actually to the criticisms, but to the criticisms

being made all over the time table itself?—The illumination I objected to.

18654. The Reader or Rows.—Was your time table defective?—There is the statement in the observation book and in the report to the effect that the time table was very defective. I do not admit that the time table was very defective. If it were very defective I would not be able to organise my school. I admit that there might be defects, which a few minutes' conversation with, or a few remarks from, an inspector could easily remedy.

18655. Mr. HARRISON.—Some of the criticisms were reasonable?—I did not object to the criticisms at all, but to the manner in which the criticism was done.

18656. With regard to this statement which you have put in from Mr. O'Brien, in which he complains of being deprived of his increment for one year, I noticed this remark in Mr. Welby's report. He says Mr. O'Brien should teach arithmetic better, and at this time of the school year his pupils of the second standard should have done more than 28 pages of their literary reader?—Yes.

18657. I suppose you allow that that is perfectly fair criticism?—Well, I would explain that in this way, that we use, in addition to the literary reader, a story reader, and sometimes more and sometimes less. We mix them up, and when you take the literary reader and compare it with the story reader I think the quantity then attained is reasonable.

18658. Your answer to that would be that the reading in those three months had not been confined to only 28 pages?—Oh, yes, certainly; there was a story reader in addition to that.

18659. Was that made quite clear to Mr. Welby?—Well, I do not really know. I presume it was explained by Mr. O'Brien.

18660. Of course, he may have thought that that was all the reading that they had done?—Well, I think Mr. Welby and all inspectors are aware that there is a story reader also, and I am also aware that he gave success reading to that particular standard.

18661. How often would the literary reader be used in the week?—Well, sometimes once a day, less frequently in the earlier classes.

18662. Well, if it is used anything like once a day 28 pages is a very small amount to get through?—But that would be on alternate days, perhaps.

18663. But it would be a very small amount?—We do not go in very much for quantity.

18664. But if they are reading it every other day I should imagine they ought to get through more than 28 pages in two or three months? The holidays come in there, and the children do not come regularly after them; so that it is often necessary to get back on the work. That is the least progressive part of our year, owing to harvesting operations—potato-digging, storing hay and corn, etc.

18665. I think the inspection was in November, and calculating that you had at any rate September, October, and November, it would be fully three months?—Yes, it would be fully three months, but our worst three months.

18666. Mr. CORRY.—There were some questions that I desired to ask you, but you have been interrogated already sufficiently with regard to them, and I need not waste the time of the Committee by asking you anything further about them, but there is one point I want to draw your attention to. That District of yours used to be very strong in mathematics in the old time, and I am only anxious to know whether Euclid, algebra, and higher mathematics are now extensively taught in that district?—Well, I do not think so; I think there is a backward tendency in that respect. I taught mathematics, and do teach them still, but for some years I have given over keeping a record and claiming results for them.

18667. You do not claim fees for your mathematics?—I do not claim fees, for the simple reason that I had an inspector some time ago examining my school in mathematics, and he "felled" the best boys I had, really good boys. He also told me that if those boys

22nd July, 1913.]

Mr. EMMETT CROWE examined.

[Continued.]

wanted to learn mathematics they should go outside his district. An inspector told me that, so I thought it was time to stop presenting pupils in mathematics.

18668. That is that he was not in sympathy with the teaching of mathematics, or did not want it done in the school?—On the contrary, he was opposed to them, and he said, "If those boys want mathematics let them go to other schools, secondary schools, and pay for it." He then asked me if I got payment for the teaching, and I said "No," and he said, "Let them go and pay for it."

18669. And do you think the teaching of algebra and geometry and Euclid has largely diminished in the district?—I certainly think it has.

Mr. CROWE.—That is really all that I want to ask you. You have a very creditable record, Mr. Crowe, as a teacher, and I am surprised to find that you got censured for some trifling matter in the face of your excellent reports and excellent records.

18670. The Broom or Rice.—There was one sentence

in Mr. O'Brien's statement of which you gave some explanation before the conference where he says, "The principal and myself went to considerable trouble and expense to provide dual desks and other requirements for kindergarten." You told us when asked by the chairman, that you yourselves did not pay the money, but that you raised the money in the district?—Yes, my lord.

18671. What I want to know is whether the manager of the school gave you any assistance, or patronised or encouraged the movement in any way for collecting this money, or did he stand completely aloof?—He certainly gave us every facility for raising the money. An entertainment was carried on in the school.

18672. And he patronised it?—Oh, he did, certainly; and then, of course, we got two-thirds also from the Board. The dual desks cost £24, and we got £16 from the Board, and we raised the other £8 by a local entertainment.

Mr. MICHAEL O'GORMAN, B.A., Principal of Killenale National School, examined.

18673. The CHAIRMAN.—You are at present principal of the Killenale Boys' School?—Yes.

18674. How long have you been principal of that?—Since January, 1910.

18675. Then you had been principal of another school?—Yes, Clonsilla.

18676. From 1895 to 1899—am I right in that?—Yes.

18677. What were the numbers of your first school?—The average attendance was about 40, from 45 to 50; it varied a little.

18678. What are the numbers of your present school?—The average attendance in my present school is over 80.

18679. Then you have one or two assistants?—One assistant and one monitor.

18700. And you have been there since 1897?—Yes.

18701. And what is your present grade?—I am an inter-grade, between the second of first and the first of first. My salary is £185 exclusive of capitation grant.

18702. And how long have you been an inter-grade?—Since the change.

18703. Thirteen years?—Since 1900.

18704. That is where you were placed on the introduction of the New System?—Yes; the amalgamated salary was £125.

18705. Under the Old System?—Under the Old System.

18706. So that you have had no rise in the last thirteen years?—No, sir.

18707. Now, you have got in here a number of reports. Who are your present inspectors?—Mr. Welys is the Senior Inspector and Mr. D. P. Fitzgerald the District Inspector.

18708. Mr. Fitzgerald has come lately?—Yes.

18709. Who was the inspector before him?—Mr. P. J. Fitzgerald.

18710. I see in your paper you refer to some remarks in the observation book on the inspection of the 12th of October, 1909?—Yes.

18711. That was an incidental inspection by Mr. Welys, and there were 91 children present?—Yes. Mr. Welys, on his first visit, 12th October, 1909 (a very wet morning), walked to the desk and did not interrupt himself, but said, "How many have you to-day?" I replied 91. He said, "What a large number in one room." I at once concluded he was an inspector, and asked should I go on with the business. He replied, "Yes." The first lesson I taught after his arrival was a reading lesson to the senior standards, on which he remarked in the Observation Book, "Do not interrupt children too much whilst reading." I got each boy to read what I considered sufficient, and then examined him on any passage that required elucidation. As soon as the class would have been finished, I would have taken a résumé of the whole lesson and examined the class collectively had I time to do so.

18712. But what we are chiefly interested in is the

mode of inspection. Will you proceed to Mr. Welys's mode of inspection?—Yes; that was at the general inspection held on the 15th January, 1910.

18713. But on the incidental inspection he found fault with cleanliness, with the grouping of standards and the training of infants, but he says, "Otherwise the school as a whole makes a favourable impression?"—Yes, on that occasion I explained to him that Rule 127 (b) was just after being relaxed in October, 1909, and he said, "You are now eligible for promotion," and I said "Yes."

18714. Now, we proceed to his second inspection of 11th January, 1910. What have you to say about that?—Well, his examination was held on the lines of the old marks system. The examination was entirely individual. He made no distinction between the pupils that attended regularly and those who were irregular attenders, and he made no distinction in his questions between dull boys and clever boys.

18715. Did he mark each pupil individually?—No; I suppose he may have done so in his note-book or he may have taken note of it.

18716. Have you anything more to say about his style of examining?—Yes; he hurried the children on at the senior classes, at the written work, that is dictation and arithmetic; he was inpatient towards the children, and made the remark several times, "You ought to hurry on; you are long enough at that."

18717. And how long did he take at this examination?—From five minutes to nine until ten minutes after four.

18718. Mr. COFFEY.—Was that his first examination of your school?—First general examination.

18719. Mr. HENLY.—He began at five minutes to eight?—From five minutes to nine till ten minutes past four.

18720. The CHAIRMAN.—Then you speak of his manner towards the staff?—Yes, I have Mr. McNally's evidence; he has made a statement.

18721. Do you wish to read that?—Yes; I can state the points. This was in the written exercise. "The inspector passed through the desks to examine the written work. One of the fourth standard boys had his school copy-book mislaid. I told the boy in charge of the copy-books to give him the book of an absentee to work on whilst awaiting the finding of his school copy-book. The boy, overhearing me, then took out an old exercise book from his bundle of school books and commenced to write in it, and as Mr. Welys passed over to him and looked through the exercise book, I observed him tearing out leaves from this book and bringing them away. Mr. Welys did not mention what he saw in those leaves to me. I then went over to draw his attention to the fact that the boy's school copy-book had been mislaid, and that we were using this private book pending the finding of his regular school copy-book. Mr. Welys seemed not to accept this explanation as true. He showed me one of the leaves which he had torn out and was taking

22nd July, 1913.]

Mr. MICHAEL O'GORMAN, B.A., examined.

[Continued.]

away, on which there were some marked "errors" which were incorrect, and also the words "very good" written at the foot of the page. I explained that neither the marks nor the words "very good" were in my handwriting, as a comparison with my marking in the other copy-books would show, and that this was not the boy's school copy-book, that I did not give written home work, and that he was using this book while his regular school copy-book was being searched for. Mr. Welby left me under the impression that he thought my explanation unsatisfactory. Just then the boy's school copy-book was found, and shown by me to Mr. Welby, who examined it and found it marked and corrected up to date. On being questioned by me, the boy replied that the exercises had been simply done at home. Mr. Welby retained and brought away the leaves of the copy-book."

18722. What do you wish to enforce by that?—That he distrusted Mr. McNally's explanation.

18723. That he distrusted his word?—Yes. Well, I can give two more instances of where he distrusted Mr. McNally's statements. One was when the third and fourth standards were both being examined on the map of Ireland together, and the third standard had not been taught the map of Ireland. Mr. McNally was begged away from the class for a while, and Mr. Welby made the remark afterwards that the geography of fourth standard was not good; so Mr. McNally said, "You have examined the third and fourth standards," and he replied, "I did not." Mr. McNally said, "I beg your pardon, you did, sir," and he replied, "If I did examine them you were there just to tell me that they were the third standard, and I am sure you would have told me so if the third standard were being examined."

18724. That was one instance?—Yes, and in the case of the drawing exercises of the children they were not dated, and Mr. Welby said: "How am I to know that these drawing exercises are done within the year, for they are not dated?" Mr. McNally said: "Well, from the sequence of objects in the drawing I think you can see that they have been done within the year," and Mr. Welby said: "That is not sufficient proof; in the North of Ireland I saw cases where the drawing exercises had the dates of the exercises erased for the purpose of making it to be believed that the exercises had been done during the year, that is the dates of that year were put on." These are the three points in connection with suspicion.

18725. Showing distrust of the teachers and yourself?—Well, with regard to myself, he mentioned in the observation book—"The Register has not been completely posted up."

18726. He made an observation on the visit of the 12th May, 1910. Will you explain that?—Well, this visit was for the purpose of examining candidate monitors, and according to Rule 181 this would be inconsistent with his report.

18727. Read that rule to the Committee?—"Inspectors recommend candidates for monitorship only in schools in which the organisation, methods of instruction, premises, furniture, apparatus and accommodation are satisfactory." Well, Mr. Welby has cited in the document which is published in the first volume of the evidence of this Inquiry that "In recent years I have no doubt that Mr. O'Gorman's school did not deserve the mark 'very good.'"

18728. We have that before us. Here are the words you refer to:—"I have not the smallest doubt in the world that Mr. O'Gorman, the principal of this school, has not at any time during recent years deserved the award 'very good.'" That is amongst the observations of Mr. Welby on these various schools, of which yours is one?—Yes; and if you read the report of Mr. Welby, in 1910, though the heading is "good," still the inference from that report was that it did not deserve higher than "fair," which would bring it under Rule 131.

18729. That is the rule which says that inspectors recommend candidates for monitorship only in schools in which the organisation and methods of instruction are satisfactory?—Yes.

18730. That is your point?—Yes; and if they were unsatisfactory, why did he recommend the appointment of a monitor?

18730a. That is the point. He recommended the appointment of a monitor under circumstances conflicting with the rule of the Board?—Yes.

18731. Now, would you go on to the next point, about the register?—Yes; he states in the Observation Book that the register has not been completely posted up, and he also mentions that in his letter to the Board. Well, the only omissions in the register at the time were few, and I brought the register to show the omissions. They are marked by a note in green pencil. That is Mr. Welby's own mark. (Witness hands in document.)

18732. You enumerate these four cases on page 186?—Yes, on page 186. One boy's attendance not entered. That is the attendance for the year. That is one of the cases. Then I mention on page 188 two boys' attendances not entered for the year, and on page 176 the date of stealing of a boy from the roll not entered.

18733. And those you declare were the only omissions?—Yes; that can be seen from the register, because he marked those omissions with a green pencil.

18734. Was he not justified in noticing those omissions?—Yes; but what is the inference that you will draw from the statement that "the register is not fully posted up"?

18735. Would not that confirm his remark?—Well, the conclusion that I would draw from it would be that the register was in arrears, perhaps for years.

18736. Mr. CONWAY.—And if it were in arrears, would that be regarded by any sensible man as a matter of any importance?—I do not think so.

18737. Mr. HENRY.—The register is of very little value?—So far as the keeping of the register is concerned, you have the same information in the roll-book that you have in the register; you have the number of attendance that each child makes.

18738. Is that an old register?—It is 40 years old, 1873.

18738a. The CHAIRMAN.—And then you say, "I shall submit Observation Book and minutes of reports since I took charge of this school"?—Yes.

18739. You begin with the year 1867?—Yes; that is the first year.

18740. In your present school?—No, in Clonsilla school. "The school was in a very low state of efficiency when the present teacher took charge of it a year ago, and a considerable improvement has taken place since his appointment. Due attention has been paid to order and discipline, and the boys are well conducted. The school accounts have been correctly kept." Then, in 1867—"The general proficiency is good. The teacher appears to be working hard, and with success. The discipline is good, and the pupils are self-reliant." Then, in 1868—"Order, discipline and moral tone are quite satisfactory." 1869—"The school work on the whole is in an efficient and progressive state. The pupils are orderly and self-reliant." Then came your change to Killynake, in January, 1890, and the first report, in 1890, is—"The school has made good progress since the present principal took charge, and the work is now in an efficient state. Order and discipline are satisfactorily maintained." 1891—"Steady and substantial progress has been made during the year, and a good standard of efficiency continues to be made in the school. The requirements of order and discipline are well attended to." 1892—"A good feature of this school is the development of the intelligence of the pupils. They are also orderly and well conducted." Then the same inspector, in 1896, says—"The proficiency was generally excellent, and good order and discipline has been maintained effectively and quietly." Then the same inspector, in 1894—"The answering all round was highly creditable. Good discipline and order was quickly and effectively maintained." Then, in 1895, Mr. Lynam says—"This important school continues to be excellently taught in all branches, except, perhaps, book-keeping." The same inspector, in 1896, says—"This school continues to be very well conducted in all respects, the answering in many subjects reaching a high standard." In 1897, the same inspector says—"There is a very perceptible falling-off in the proficiency of this school from the high standard

28th July, 1913.]

Mr. MICHAEL O'GORMAN, B.A., continued.

[Continued.]

usually attained in former years. The reading of all classes, but especially of the fourth (taught by the assistant), is very poor. Grammar and spelling are also weak. Action ordered on report."

18741. What was the action?—"Manager will urge the teachers to exert themselves strenuously during the current year to restore the school to a thoroughly satisfactory state of efficiency." Domestic affliction, the death of my wife in this year, was the cause of this adverse report. The inspector told me afterwards that he had accounted to the Board for the falling off in proficiency. Yet after eleven years of highly efficient service the Board thought fit to ask the manager to admonish me.

18742. Then the same inspector, in 1896, says—"A number of extra and optional subjects have been crated this year, but on the ordinary programme the school has quite recovered its normal state of high efficiency. Discipline and order are well maintained." I applied to the Board for copies of the reports for the years 1899, 1900 and 1901, as the originals were mislaid, but as yet I have not received them.

18743. That accounts for your not having been able to forward them to this Committee?—Yes; but I can state that they were equally as good. Then, in 1902, Mr. Lavelle says—"The method of conducting the ordinary business of this school is highly creditable." Mr. W. A. Brown, in 1903, says—"This school is doing well. I am pleased to find very good progress in the singing."

18744. The report for 1904 is missing?—I have here the Observation Book, in which Mr. Brown says, in 1904—"The school generally is doing well."

18745. Mr. Brown, in 1905, says—"Very good work has been done generally." Mr. McEnery, in 1906, says—"The instruction generally is on intelligent lines, and very creditable progress is exhibited in most branches of the programme." The same inspector, in 1907, says—"The work of the principal teacher is very diligent and very effective, whilst that of the assistant is generally good, and the school on the whole is in a satisfactory condition." The same inspector, in 1908, says—"The school maintains a high standard of efficiency. All parts of the work show life and general interest, and satisfactory progress is made in most branches. The pupils are attentive, keen to answer questions, and under good discipline." Then, in 1909, no annual inspection was held. That completes your list?—Yes. In 1909, 1906, 1907 and 1908 the merit mark was "very good."

18746. Now, go on to the paragraph about Mr. Welply's remarks on the discipline of your school?—Yes. Mr. Welply's remarks on the discipline of the school entirely disagree with the reports for twenty years previous. From 1885 till 1913, whenever the discipline and order were mentioned in the reports, they had been highly praised.

18747. You say that in all these or most of them the discipline has been praised, and never has it been found fault with?—Never.

18748. Mr. HENRY.—How you put in Mr. Welply's report?—I have not put it in with the other report, but I hand it in now.

18749. The CHAIRMAN.—I will read it. This is 11th January, 1910:—"After much hesitation I have decided to award this school a good report; but unless the defects I have pointed out are amended I shall on a future occasion be disposed to estimate the proficiency as no higher than 'fair.' Arithmetic and mental calculations are no better than 'fair' in any standard. Grammar is 'fair' only; oral composition is weak; object lessons are not effectively taught; history is barely known. Many of the pupils are much too old for the standard in which they are enrolled. Junior penmanship could be greatly improved by proper teaching, and better discipline and order could very easily be maintained"—these are the words you referred to?—Yes, sir.

18750. Then he goes on?—"This school is by no means on a par with the adjoining girls' school. A complete set of new maps is required." I—With reference to his remarks about the discipline of the school, the infants left the school at 2 o'clock every day. At present they leave at a quarter to two, but in 1910 they

left at 2; and when 2 o'clock came I asked Mr. Welply could the infants leave. He said that he wanted them for object lesson; so they were kept sitting down on the form from 2 o'clock till a quarter to three. They were under no supervision, because the assistant and myself were engaged with Mr. Welply in reading dictation or helping in some way, and we had not time to look after the infants. There were no monitors that year in the school. Naturally enough, when 2 o'clock came, the infants got uneasy afterwards, being under no supervision, it would be hard to expect them to keep quiet.

18751. That is your explanation?—That is my explanation.

18752. So there was some disorder?—Well, I suppose there was.

18753. To what extent?—To that extent.

18754. Then the infants were not under any person who could control them for the moment?—That is so.

18755. And that is the complete account that you want to give of that?—Well, I want to contrast the previous reports for 25 years, whenever order and discipline were mentioned. That is all.

18756. In fact, in putting in that record of the school that is what you mean shortly, to emphasize the fact that the discipline had always been praised?—Yes.

18757. And you say that the record of the school can be seen from the Observation Book and the minutes of reports, and also from the names of your pupils. You want to bring out the number of your successes in preparing for different examinations?—Yes, public examinations.

18758. Will you pass on to that. Did the pupils pass directly from this school?—Yes, and received no other instruction than mine. I have the names of the pupils here if it is necessary to read them. In 1906 Philip Shelly matriculated in the Royal University, entered Thomas Deane's College immediately after, and the following year obtained a free place in Lissen Reekawastical College. In 1907 Robert O'Shea passed the entrance examination to Ballyheale Agricultural Station. In 1908 Michael Hayes passed the entrance examination to Ushaw Seminary, Durham, the subjects being Greek, Latin, English and Mathematics.

18759. Are you a graduate of the University?—Yes, I am a graduate of the Royal University.

18760. Then you have something about a scholarship at Glenties?—In 1908 James Quigley obtained an entrance scholarship to Glenties under the Agriculture Department, and in the same year Daniel Delaney matriculated in the Royal University, and in 1910 John Casey passed the entrance examination to the National Bank on first trial. In 1910 Richard Foley obtained an entrance scholarship to Ballyheale, and in 1911 Thomas Donovan and John Corcoran obtained £20 scholarships offered by the Tipperary South Riding County Council. There were ten scholarships altogether, and they succeeded in taking two of them.

18761. And you wish to point to that record and to the fact that you have all those reports?—Yes; and to contrast that with Mr. Welply's statement that in recent years the school did not deserve "very good," whereas I have had all these favourable reports from 1900, and the successes of pupils from the school from the year 1906 to 1911, and especially those in 1910 and 1911, at the time that Mr. Welply stated that the school was not "very good."

18762. Is that all you have to tell us about your record?—Yes, I think so.

18763. You have something on the third page about Mr. Fitzpatrick's report in 1910?—Yes; the minute of Mr. Fitzpatrick's report in 1910 was marked "good," though I asked him at the conclusion of the examination if he was pleased, and he replied "Yes, it is a pleasure to visit your school, and see how it is conducted."

18764. And yet he gave it only "good"?—He gave it only "good." I asked him would he recommend me for promotion to first of first grade.

18765. That was before you knew that his minute was "good"?—Yes; I did not get it for two months. When he said that it was a pleasure to visit my school

22nd July, 1913.]

Mr. MICHAEL O'GORMAN, B.A., continued.

[Continued.]

and see how it was conducted, I asked him would he recommend me for promotion to first of first grade. He said he would, but asked me at the same time would I not want to get the mark "excellent" in order to get promotion to first of first grade. I said I did not think so, and that "very good" would do; and he said, "I certainly will recommend you." But I am sure, at least I conclude myself, that he had a consultation with Mr. Welpy afterwards, and that Mr. Welpy prevented him giving me the mark "very good."

18766. You thought at the time that he meant to give you "very good"?—Yes.

18767. Not "excellent," but "very good"?—Not "excellent," but "very good."

18768. And that in the meantime he changed his mind?—Well, my inference is that he must have had a consultation with Mr. Welpy.

18769. I suppose he would have had to consult the senior inspector before raising the mark?—Yes.

18770. You say you are anxious to know what your own personal mark was?—Yes; I am anxious to know what my own personal mark was, and the reason of that is that at the last examination he said, "I am not awarding the school higher than 'good'." I said I was sorry. (Of course I knew the reason was not because the school did not deserve higher than "good," but that he would have to consult Mr. Welpy over it.) "But I have heard you giving a lesson on geometry to-day, I have heard you teaching on history and geography, and I was very pleased to see the amount of history that the pupils had gone through. The arithmetic is good, but the discipline of the juniors should be improved." Of course, Mr. Welpy's successors have always remarked on the discipline of the school.

18771. Here is a minute referring to Mr. Fitzpatrick's inspection of the 15th and 16th of November, 1910. The inspector remarks—"Speaking generally, the progress made during the year is good. This applies specially to the junior division. In the senior division more attention may be paid to mental arithmetic. More thorough teaching in composition is required, as the boys display very little power of thought and expression. The playground is very uneven, and not safe to play in, owing to the peckering stones. Many are old and dingy; more wall tablets required."—That is Mr. Fitzpatrick's report. Mr. Fitzgerald's is there also.

18772. What year would that be for?—The next year.

18773. This is Mr. P. J. Fitzgerald's report of the inspection held on the 8th November, 1912:—"This school has only one room, and under such conditions really high-class work is not possible. The teachers are earnest and capable, and their efforts meet with a large measure of success. The senior pupils are, on the whole, well taught. It would be possible, however, even under existing circumstances, to improve the reading in these standards. The written work of all standards is capable of improvement, and an effort should be made to advance the pupils more rapidly from first and second standard. There are many grown boys in these. The training of infants, too, in oral English should be more effective. Singing and drawing are well taught." That is all you want read out of that report?—Yes; and the next report is from Mr. P. J. Fitzgerald again. I have not got the mark "very good" since Mr. Welpy reduced the mark in 1910. I have not got "very good" from any inspector since.

18774. It has always been "good"?—Only "good."

18775. Then you have something to say to us about your preparation of your boys and girls in geometry and algebra?—Yes; every time I presented children for mathematics I got full marks.

18776. And does that come down to recent years?—Yes. This year I had a class of 31 boys and 19 girls for mathematics; they were all first year's geometry, and I had first, second and third year algebra, and the inspector had recommended me for full fees.

18777. Who was that?—Mr. D. P. Fitzgerald, my present inspector. He examined them in May.

18778. And was that the inspector who gave you "good" on the whole school?—No, his brother.

18779. You were very successful in teaching geometry of the first year, and first, second and third year algebra?—Yes.

18780. You did not appeal from Mr. Welpy's report?—I can give a good reason for it.

18781. Are you inclined to give that to us?—Yes, I am. In 1910 the examination was held on the 11th of January. I got my minute on the 18th of March, nearly three months afterwards, and a good portion of the year had been gone over since the examination was held, and domestic trouble prevented me working the school as well as I might otherwise do. My wife was under the care of two doctors from the middle of January till September. She was up in Dublin in June, and was examined by Dr. Smith, who thought that it would be necessary for her to undergo an operation. Well, naturally enough, under such conditions my mind was a little distracted.

18782. Very well; if I had known of that I would not have asked you to go into it. But after that why did you not appeal from Mr. Fitzpatrick's report?—Well, I did not think there would be any good in appealing from Mr. Fitzpatrick, because in a neighbouring school under the same manager the teacher had applied through the manager for a re-inspection, which was refused.

18783. And it was that example that deterred you from appealing?—Yes, and from what I read at the time.

18784. And the minute reached you two months after that inspection?—Yes; two months after.

18785. Now, we come to the visit of Dr. Starkie, on the 6th of October, 1911. He arrived after the pupils had left the school, you say?—Yes.

18786. And so all he could do was to look at some of the exercises of the boys, and make inquiries about your senior inspector?—Yes.

18787. He was down at that time for that special purpose?—Yes.

18788. It is stated that he was requested by the Board to visit the district, and then he was followed by Mr. Hynes?—Mr. Hynes did not visit my school.

18789. Dr. Starkie was only there ten minutes?—Yes.

18790. And what did he do when he was there?—Well, he had a note-book, and he took notes of the written exercises and took notes of what faults I had to find with Mr. Welpy's style of examination, and himself and Mr. Dillworth were present, and the whole thing lasted ten minutes; and he was in the adjoining school before he came to me. That is conducted by my wife, and he asked her, "What faults have you to find with Mr. Welpy?" and she was rather taken by surprise, and she said, "I really have no fault to find with him," and Dr. Starkie said, "No good teacher has." Then, after a while, she remembered his manner, but she did not say anything to Dr. Starkie about it.

18791. And had Dr. Starkie ever been in that district before on one of those visits?—Not in Killesnoe district, I mean in the district round Killesnoe, but I see he was in different schools in the district.

18792. But before that year had you heard of him visiting any of your schools in that district?—Yes; I heard that he made some visits to schools.

18793. Had he paid a visit to that circuit of yours before?—Oh, yes; I think six months before that.

18794. Had he?—I think so; I think he was in Galbally, but I am not quite sure; but I know that he was in other schools.

18795. You know that he visited that district that you live in?—Yes.

18796. Shortly before this visit?—Yes, before this visit.

18797. And that would be after the time that Mr. Welpy came to the district?—Yes.

18798. Mr. CORRY.—Are you quite clear on that?—On what?

18799. On the statement that Dr. Starkie was in the circuit before that October visit that he made to your school?—Well, I am not quite sure whether he was in the circuit immediately before or after the visit to my school, but I heard that he visited some schools.

18800. Mr. HYNES.—In previous years?—Yes.

18801. The CHAIRMAN.—Dr. Starkie went about visiting your school and other schools for a particular purpose in October, 1911?—Yes.

18802. What I asked you, and what Mr. Coffey asked you, was, did you know of his having visited your circuit, say, the previous year?—No, I did not.

18803. Mr. HENRY.—You do not know whether he did or not?—I could not say which. I do not know.

18804. Mr. COFFEY.—Now, will you go on to this remark you make on the wording of Rule 127 (b), that is—"Boys under seven years of age are ineligible for enrolment in a boys' school where there is no mistress unless, first, there is no suitable mistress available in the locality, or, second, the probable effect of this rule will be the loss of an assistant teacher in the school." Will you explain how this affected you?—It affected me in two ways. First of all, I would have been entitled to promotion to first of first grade, from my reports, from the 1st of April, 1908. My average attendance in 1907 was sufficient for the year ending the 31st of December, 1907.

18805. Mr. HENRY.—What was it?—70.

18806. It was over 70?—Yes; and it would qualify me.

18807. The CHAIRMAN.—Now proceed?—My average attendance for every year since 1907 was over 70. Well, on the mark of the school I should have been promoted from the 1st of April, 1908, that is, if the promotion would date from the 1st of April, and I suffered a loss of £4. My salary was £185 and capitation. The lowest salary for first of first grade is £180, so that if I was put into first of first grade and received only the lowest salary of that grade it would have been an increase of £4 a year, so, by not being in first of first grade in 1908 I lost £12—that is, £4 for 1908, £4 for 1909, and £4 for 1910; and I understand that now a teacher is entitled to an increment in first of first grade even on the mark "good," and that "very good" would not be required.

18808. Mr. HENRY.—What was your average in 1907?—In 1908 it was under 70; it was 68.5.

18809. The CHAIRMAN.—Will you finish that point about the loss?—Well, I suffered a loss in capitation grant.

18810. You say that under this Rule 127 (b) the principal was deprived of £5 in 1908 and the assistant of £2 10s. 0d. 1s.—Yes.

18811. In 1909 the principal was deprived of £5 10s. 0d. and the assistant of £2 10s. 0d. In 1909 the rules were relaxed, so as to exclude only children under five years?—Under five years.

18812. And then you got your full grant?—I got the full amount of capitation.

18813. But the assistant suffered?—The assistant suffered.

18814. You have already gone into the matter of the way your promotion was affected by that rule?—Yes.

18815. The promotion would probably date from the 1st of April, 1908?—And just at the very time that I would be entitled to promotion Mr. Welby's report deprived me of it in 1905. The rule was relaxed in October, 1909, and Mr. Welby came on, and reminded me that I was eligible for promotion to first of first grade now since the relaxation of the rule. It was hardly necessary to remind me of that, because I was looking forward to getting promotion to first of first grade, and if there could have been an incentive to make me work the harder that would have been a quite sufficient incentive. In any case, I would not relax my efforts.

18816. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—You refer to the statements made by Mr. Welby, and as the observations that appear in our report are not in chronological order it might be just as well to make the order quite clear. The first reference to your school in the appendix to the Blue Book is at D, on page 203?—Yes, I think so.

18817. It begins—"For nine years in succession this school, in charge of a highly classed and most successful teacher, was marked 'very good' by various inspectors." That is the first reference to it?—Yes.

18818. Then, on page 301, Mr. Welby's observations on your school appear in the second column?—Yes.

18819. And, then, your reply appears on page 207?—Yes.

18820. And, then, Mr. Welby refers to that again in page 212 in the second column?—Yes.

18821. And it is in reply to the observations that appear in that appendix that you have given your evidence now?—Yes.

18822. Mr. COFFEY.—From all your previous inspections under the National Board prize was uniform?—Yes.

18823. And the first adverse comments that you got on your work were from Mr. Welby?—Yes; after 25 years' teaching.

18824. On what did Mr. Welby base his statement, do you know, that the teacher does not make preparation for his work?—Well, I cannot say, because I did not ask for the progress record, which I had filled in; and I also had a plan of work prepared, a weekly plan of work, and a daily plan of work sometimes. I did not make elaborate notes, as I thought from my long experience as a teacher that it would not be necessary to make elaborate notes, and I just jotted down a few headings from time to time, and in the first week after vacation, and second week after vacation, particularly after the Christmas vacation, my time would be spent in improving the subjects that I found weak at the Christmas examination of the children. But as a matter of fact, I have brought up a plan of preparation which Mr. Welby initiated on that day, the 13th of January, 1910.

18825. He put his own initials on it?—Yes, his own initials. (Witness hands in document.) On the other side of the book you will see the plan of work.

18826. Yes, this plan of work is initiated by Mr. Welby on the 13th of January, 1910. How long had you remained after the Christmas holidays when he came to examine?—The second day.

18827. Do you think it was a fair or a just way to come to examine the school two days after resumption of duty?—Not when the examination was an individual one. An individual examination was not a thing that I was prepared for.

18828. But, apart from whether it was an individual examination or not, would you think it fair that the value of your year's work should be ascertained on an inspection the second day after the school had resumed?—I would not. Had I got due notice of the examination it would, of course, be better.

18829. Of course, I may say myself that I am glad to hear that Mr. Welby examines the schools very fully, because my point of view is that the schools at present are insufficiently examined; but I can quite see that Mr. Welby, with his great capabilities and with the best intentions, coming at that time would be sure, even quite unwittingly, to work injuriously to the teacher. You have not been in the habit of having this individual examination for some years?—No. Previous inspectors examined just in the spirit of the new system.

18830. And, then, without any notice you were brought up against this individual examination?—Yes.

18831. So that that is a point on which, I think, you have a good deal to complain of?—I feel that I have been very unjustly treated in that way. Another fact, too, in regard to Mr. Welby's visits in October and in January is, that he never told me during the whole time of the examination about this fault which he jotted down in the Observation Book—the register not being completely filled in. I did not know that until he had left, and I was quite surprised to see such an observation.

18832. For those who do not know anything about the schools it might be well to mention that in England, and even in the Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, what they call the register is really the roll-book. Now, neglect of the roll-book I would regard as a very serious thing, but neglect of some entries in the register I think no man who knows anything about the schools would ever regard as anything but trifling?—It shows the disposition of Mr. Welby to find fault.

18833. You have stated that his manner tended to discourage the whole school. That is a statement of yours in one of these documents?—Yes.

18834. Kindly explain how his manner tended to discourage the whole school?—Well, with the senior

class that he examined in grammar. He sat at the desk, and brought in one boy and marked a sentence for him and told him to go back; the next boy came in and got a sentence in the same way, and was told to go back; this going in and coming back, of course, interfered with the discipline of the children, while each child was brought in and sent back again, and he repeatedly hurried the children at their work, particularly at their written work, and spoke to them in rather an irritable tone or strain, and showed no sympathy whatsoever.

18835. He has said, "After hesitation I have decided to give this school 'good'," but all your previous marks for some years had been "very good"—Yes.

18836. And this was the observation of Mr. Welby at his first inspection?—At his first general inspection.

18837. Mr. Fitzpatrick led you to think that you were entitled to "very good"?—Yes.

18838. You are quite clear on that?—I am quite clear; I remember it very distinctly.

18839. The Chairman asked you why you did not appeal, and you explained that you had seen that appeals in other cases were futile?—Yes.

18840. That they had no success; that they were not attended to?—That they were not considered.

18841. When you decided not to appeal did you take into account the fact that it was Mr. Welby who dissuaded or kept Mr. Fitzpatrick from giving you the mark "very good"?—Yes, that was my conclusion.

18842. And that your appeal, if you appealed at all, would be from Mr. Fitzpatrick to Mr. Welby?—Yes.

18843. There is a remark in some of these reports about the bad equipment of your school—about the poverty of its equipment in the way of maps, and the walls being dingy and the playground being uneven and dangerous. Have those things been set right?—Well, I do not care to touch on that point at all.

18844-5. The Bazaar of Ross.—Now, with reference to those boys that you got matriculated in the University and that passed the other examinations, were you able to deal with those seventh and eighth standard boys in your school or were they on your school records at all?—All except one boy, who, when he reached the age of 18, had to be struck off, and that was just a few months before he went up for the matriculation examination.

18846. Were you able to fit in their studies under the eighth standard?—Of course, I taught them outside school hours. At the ordinary subjects they were with the other children.

18847. You got special fees, I presume?—Yes; and I also got toll fees for Latin from the National Board on one occasion that I had a class presented.

18848. You got fees from the boys themselves, and then you also got special results fees from the National Board?—Yes.

18849. On those individual subjects?—Yes, when results fees were granted. There are no results fees granted now for Latin by the National Board.

18850. When were they stopped?—In the last few years.

18851. Did you get those boys examined in mathematics by an inspector of the National Board?—Yes.

18852. And you got fees on that?—Yes, my lord.

18853. Did the girls belong to the neighbouring school?—Yes.

18854. And they came to you for the extra subjects?—Yes, my lord.

18855. And your infant boys were sent out to the girls' school, were they?—No, my lord; the manager would not allow them.

18856. They were in your school but not on the rolls?—Yes, they were on the rolls, but their attendance was excluded.

18857. And when the rule was relaxed they were put on the rolls again?—Yes.

18858. So that during the last three years you have been getting a capitation grant on them?—Yes.

18859. But for a period of two or three years you got no capitation grant?—Yes.

18860. Mr. HENLY.—In the examination in 1909, what was objected to with regard to the grouping of the standards, for you mention "grouping of standards"?—He mentioned that in the Observation Book, but made no remark to me personally.

18861. But what does it mean—what is meant by what you have here, "grouping of standards"?—That is an extract from Mr. Welby's remark.

18862. Just read it?—That is after the October examination?

18863. Yes?—"Section 4—Grouping of standards should be avoided of more fully."

18864. Now, did he discuss with you that report?—He discussed nothing with me.

18865. Did he give you any explanation as to what he meant by grouping of standards being avoided of more fully?—No, he made no observation to me personally, except his remarks in the Observation Book.

18866. What way did you group?—I grouped the fifth and higher standards together for reading and arithmetic, and I grouped the third standard for singing, and the infants' first and second for singing also.

18867. What system of organisation did you adopt?—Well, it is a mixture. It is not exactly the bi-partite; it is divided into three parts; it is tri-partite. Sometimes there are only two divisions—infants' first and second at singing and drawing, and the senior classes are at singing; that is, the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth are at singing.

18868. Now, you say that the classes were examined individually?—Yes.

18869. Your complaint, I take it, is that you understand the official regulations to be that you are under a system of inspection?—Yes; and not individual examination.

18870. And, therefore, your complaint is that Mr. Welby in carrying out that examination was violating the whole spirit of the system under which you are working at the present time?—Yes; and the spirit that was observed by his predecessors, and is observed still.

18871. On this question of being suspicious of the teacher, have you anything additional to say?—Only what I have stated about Mr. McNally and what I stated about the register.

18872. And was that suspiciousness shown in such a way that intelligent pupils could see that he was suspicious of you?—Oh, yes; and in presence of the school the books were torn out of the copy-book.

18873. But would not that be right?—Yes, it would, if he had not got a satisfactory explanation, which he had from Mr. McNally.

18874. But would he not be justified in taking away specimens of the work of the pupils?—Yes, if the exercise book was the school exercise book.

18875. Then the inference you drew from that report as a whole was that in Mr. Welby's opinion the order and organisation of your school were not quite satisfactory?—Yes; that is what he stated.

18876. He has stated that?—Yes.

18877. And yet, notwithstanding that, he recommended the appointment of a monitor, although such an appointment should only be recommended if the organisation and discipline were satisfactory?—Yes.

18878. And, therefore, in your opinion, the fact that he recommended the appointment of the monitor was inconsistent with the character of his previous report?—Inconsistent with the character of his previous report. Those observations about the Register are totally at variance with the idea that anybody would form of their importance.

18879. Now, you contend from your history that your record as a teacher and as a disciplinarian has been satisfactory for 20 years?—For 25 years, from 1898—20 years in Kilmacule, and 5 years previously.

18880. We have it in evidence from Dr. Starkie that a school ought to be marked on its permanent aspects, and the permanent aspects of the school depend on the character of the teacher, and that, therefore, as long as the teacher remains there under normal conditions the character of the school is constant, and if that were observed by Mr. Welby—would you not have had the same mark as the previous year?—Yes, if I had been justly dealt with.

18881. With regard to this point which you have been questioned on by his Lordship, what proportion

23rd Feb. 1913.]

Mr. MICHAEL O'GORMAN, B.A., examined.

[Continued.]

of pupils in your school are in the higher standards?—Do you mean from the 3th up or the 4th up?

18902. Well, the higher would be from the 4th up inclusive?—Well, I would say about 25 per cent. I may remark that there has been a large influx of pupils in the last few years into Killesnoe.

18903. The Rector of Ross.—I see by your Register that you have a number of them at three years of age?—Yes, because their parents are just anxious to get rid of them, but at some previous times the percentage in some of the higher standards was more than it is now. It varies.

18904. Mr. HAMILT.—Was there any possibility of your neglecting the majority of the pupils in order to pay special attention to those boys that would be presented for examination outside?—The reports of the school for the previous years show that the school has not been neglected.

18905. Some people hold that when pupils are prepared for those examinations outside there is a danger that the teachers may neglect the majority of the pupils?—Well, considering that I gave the instruction outside school hours, and taught the whole school conscientiously for the full school day, I think there was no danger of that happening.

18906. Were those pupils that you presented for those various examinations pupils that had come specially to prepare for those examinations with you, or were they pupils who graduated out from the school?—They were pupils from the school, all with one exception.

18907. And, therefore, to have those pupils qualified for those examinations you must have taught thoroughly all the standards from the bottom to the top. Now, you are quite sure of this remark of Mr. Fitzpatrick, that "it is a pleasure to visit your school and see how it is conducted"?—Yes.

18908. And having got that remark from him you naturally were expecting "very good"?—Yes, but I did not get his report till two months afterwards.

18909. You have also presented, as you told us, a large number of pupils in mathematics?—Yes.

18910. And got full fees?—Yes.

18911. Now, will you state to this Committee the conditions under which full fees are awarded?—I do not know the definite rule about it, but the school must be at least "good" in order to get fees at all, and whether "very good" is required to get full fees or not I do not know, except from reading the evidence in the report.

18912. But if the teaching of mathematics was not regarded as in every respect satisfactory you would not have got full fees?—No.

18913. And, therefore, we have that additional evidence that your work as a teacher must have been efficient and satisfactory?—Yes.

18914. Is not that so?—Yes, sir; and Mr. FitzGerald was highly pleased with a lesson I gave on geometry to the boys and girls. After the lesson was over he said he was delighted with it.

18915. Now, when Dr. Starcke visited your school did he make any inquiries from you as to what you had to complain of?—He asked me what faults I had to find with Mr. Welpy.

18916. What answer did you give?—His system of examination and his manner to the children and to the staff.

18917. What did you state as regarding his manner?—I said he was irritable.

18918. Anything else?—And that he hurried the children.

18919. What steps did Dr. Starcke take to ascertain the character of your school during that ten minutes except to look at the written exercises—did he look at many of them?—Mr. Dinwiddie looked at more than Dr. Starcke. Dr. Starcke did not look at many of them in the ten minutes. He was writing a good deal. I suppose as many as he could look at in a few minutes. He had a note of my remarks on Mr. Welpy. He was ten minutes in the school altogether, and he could not have scrutinized very many of the books.

18920. Did you regard that visit of Dr. Starcke as in any way an adequate investigation into your examinations?—No, I could not.

18921. You were one of those, I presume, who signed that appeal sent up to the Board?—Yes.

18922. And as a result of that appeal what redress have you got?—None.

18923. So far as you know?—None, so far as I know; in fact I have suffered.

18924. In what way?—As regards promotion, by Mr. Welpy's report.

18925. There was one point on which you were questioned by Mr. Coffey that I wish to make a further reference to. Mr. Welpy wrote: "I have not the smallest doubt in the world that Mr. O'Gorman, the principal of this school, has not at any time during recent years deserved the award 'very good.' Now, do you know what grounds Mr. Welpy had for making such a strong statement as that?—He could have no grounds, unless the school suddenly went down to a very low pitch at one year, and I don't know that it did, because it was in my opinion that the school should be "very good," in order that I might get promotion after the examination of 1910; and it was a reflection on the work of the previous inspectors that Mr. Welpy should have said that.

18926. Your wife is also a teacher?—Yes.

18927. What mark has she got?—"Very good."

18928. Mr. Welpy says—"The next day but one I went into the adjoining girls' school and awarded it a "very good" report, after an equally careful and prolonged inspection. That is what I complain of more than anything else that I found here, viz., the lack of discrimination between the value of work done in different schools under precisely similar conditions. I have not the smallest doubt in the world that Mr. O'Gorman, the principal of this school, has not at any time during recent years deserved the award 'very good.'" Who is it that showed that lack of discrimination?—The previous inspectors, I suppose, according to Mr. Welpy's opinion.

18929. So that he was not at fault in awarding "very good," and I suppose the other inspectors were?—No, I am sure the school deserved the mark that Mr. Welpy gave it.

18930. And I suppose that you are under the impression that it was Mr. Welpy himself that was at fault?—Not in awarding the school "very good."

18931. Have you anything to say with reference to what he states here—"Grammar, fair only. Oral composition, weak. Object lessons, middling. History, poor. Many pupils too old for their standards."—Well, about the grammar, his examination was very different to what the children were accustomed to in great previous. He marked sentences out of a reading-book, and put the children back and asked them to look at it for a few minutes, and brought them in again; each boy got a different sentence.

18932. What did he give them the sentences for?—For the purpose of analysis and also parsing—to analyse and parse the sentence.

18933. Did he require parsing?—Yes.

18934. Did Mr. Brown?—No.

18935. So that he changed the method of teaching grammar from analysis which is recommended by the Board to analysis plus parsing?—Yes.

18936. And naturally those scholars would be taken at a disadvantage?—Yes, and even individual examination would put the children under a big disadvantage.

18937. Now he says—"Many pupils too old for their standards." What have you to say to that?—Well, in connection with Killesnoe school, Killesnoe is a small town, or you may call it a large village. There is a population of about 600, and there are quarry works at Liffan's Bridge, three miles away from the school, extensive works carried on by the Great Southern and Western Railway; there are many families that come into Killesnoe that are migratory, looking for work in Liffan's Bridge quarry, and their children do not attend any school regularly.

18938. Was the fact that they were too old for their standards due to this, that they came to school at a more or less advanced age, when their previous education had been neglected, or was it due to your detaining them too long in any standard?—It was due to their irregularity in not attending school and not being qualified for a higher standard.

18920. Were they too long detained in any standard?—They would be in some cases—not too long in one sense. In one sense they were too long, that is as regards the number of years they would be there. Of course, they would not be fit for a higher standard, and I think it would be a great injustice to a child to promote him if he was not fit for a higher standard.

18921. The CHAIRMAN.—Do you mean that the children of the migratory population that settled in Kilmacaula are badly taught, and that they come to your school and do not attend regularly, so that you are not responsible for their being in a low standard—that is your meaning?—Yes, that is my meaning. They do not attend school regularly in any place.

18922. Mr. HENRY.—But what I wanted to know is this. Do any of those migratory pupils remain long enough, so that you could be held responsible for keeping them too long in the standard in which you first enrolled them?—I do not think so.

18923. So that then the fact that they were too old for their standards was one for which there was no blame to be attached to you according to your explanation?—No blame.

18924. He goes on to say—"Junior penmanship is not taught." Is that the fact?—I do not think so. It is taught, of course.

18925. As a matter of fact, do you teach penmanship or not to the children?—The assistant has charge of the junior classes, and I have of the senior classes, and the assistant teaches writing, and teaches it properly.

18926. You are quite confident of that?—Yes.

18927. The statement here is that penmanship is not taught. Is that in accordance with the fact?—No, penmanship is taught.

18928. He said that better discipline and order are required. You have given us an answer, which I think satisfactory, to that. Then he says—"The principal does not make much preparation for work?"—Yes.

18929. Do you make sufficient preparation?—Yes.

18930. I suppose you do not hold it necessary to make preparation for every lesson; you do not think it is necessary that a man of your experience should be required to do that?—No; but, of course, I would make short notes of the lessons.

18931. Did you read that Blue Book that we issued, the first volume of the evidence?—Yes.

18932. And did you read the evidence of Mr. McNeill, in which he laid down the amount of preparation which he thinks necessary?—Yes.

18933. Do you remember it?—Yes.

18934. Would you be satisfied to give that amount of preparation. He says that if you were dealing with a lesson on such a subject as Irish railway junctions preparation would be necessary, but for an ordinary arithmetic lesson, or anything of that kind, no preparation would be necessary. Do you agree with that?—Well, when teaching a new subject in arithmetic I prepare short notes myself. When I am teaching a new rule I do that, and take notes of the exercises that I would give the children on that rule, and give them them.

18935. And would you do that in the same way with all other subjects as far as you think necessary?—Yes.

18936. And then we have—"At the next general inspection, Mr. Fitzpatrick, who cannot be accused of being a severe inspector, gave the school 'good' also." He was a junior inspector, was he not?—He was a district inspector; he was Mr. Wely's junior.

18937. With no power of altering a mark without consultation with the senior inspector?—Yes.

18938. Mr. KAVANAGH.—You have had experience of Mr. Wely and Mr. FitzGerald and Mr. Brown, I think?—Yes.

18939. The last witness told us that the teacher had to study the different finds of each inspector. Did you find that those three inspectors differed very much in their methods of inspection?—Mr. Brown and Mr. Wely differed very much.

18940. In what way?—When Mr. Brown came into the school he observed how the work was going on, and went over and listened to your teaching, and after a while asked some questions, and very often gave the teacher help in connection with his idea of how

a subject should be taught. He asked you would you consider this would be a better way of putting it. He was very courteous to the teacher. Mr. Wely never did that. Mr. P. J. FitzGerald did, and was very helpful to me in my school, and I got some useful hints from him.

18941. And you had to try to adapt your mode of teaching to the methods of the inspectors?—Yes.

18942. And I suppose that was difficult often and bad for the education of the children?—Of course.

18943. You said that you did not know your personal mark. Do you know it now at all?—No; I wish that I could get to know it.

18944. The teachers seem to mistrust that secret mark. Is that so?—According to the evidence, if a principal teacher gets "very good" and the assistant only gets "good," the mark of the school is only "good," and the principal will gain no promotion on the mark "good."

18945. What the teachers seem to dislike is having a secret mark which they do not know, and which the inspector gives them without their knowledge or without their being told about it?—Yes, we are never told that, except that Mr. FitzGerald told me last December, or whatever month he examined the school, "I will mark your work 'very good,'" and I said to him, "That is no good for me," and he said "Why?" and I said, "When the mark of the school is only 'good' I won't be eligible for promotion—it won't count in my favour."

18946. It would be no good unless your personal mark was "very good"?—No; and I wish that I could get my personal mark, because Mr. FitzGerald told me that he would give my work "very good," and that he was well pleased with it. I think that I have been very badly treated, and it is very hard to keep up enthusiasm and energy in one's work when after 25 years you find that your work is distrusted, and that when you are just eligible for increment and promotion to first of first grade (which is, I am sure, the ambition of every teacher, and I have striven hard for it), you are knocked down by the fact that a fault-finding inspector comes to you at a time when you are working hard and anxious to get promotion, and wipes all your efforts away with a stroke of his pen, and your chances are gone, not only for one year, perhaps, but as long as that senior inspector is in the district; because no junior inspector will raise the mark, in deference to the senior inspector. I got second of first class at twenty-three years of age, and I graduated in 1904, and in addition to the work that I have done in a primary school, I have done a good deal of secondary teachers' work. There is no secondary school in the district; the boys come to me from a radius of six miles round; so that I think that I have been very badly treated.

18947. Sir HENRY WHARREN.—That would be remedied if your increment and promotion were made dependent, not upon these secret marks, but were to be given unless you were declared to have worked unsatisfactorily during the previous year, that is, if increment and promotion were given to you, as it is called automatically, subject, however (as you would agree), to its being declared in case there was an unsatisfactory report which declared that you had taught unsatisfactorily during the year. Of course, you would agree to that?—Yes, sir; that is as long as the teacher does his work, and does his work satisfactorily. I do not think the teacher's promotion or increment should depend on the merit mark or on the report of one individual, and there should be some reform, which we have not got.

18948. Mr. HENRY.—I will read for you the rule dealing with increment under the London County Council, and then I want you to attend carefully and say whether it would satisfy you if it were adopted here:—"Annual increments of salary according to scale are allowed for each year of satisfactory service."

The phrase, "Year of satisfactory service," means a period of 12 months, during which a teacher has not been guilty of any grave misconduct." Would a regulation of that kind satisfy you?—Yes, I think that would be very suitable.

FORTY-FIRST DAY.—THURSDAY, 24TH JULY, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—**Sir SAMUEL DELL, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D. (Chairman);** The Most Rev **DENNIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross;** **Sir HIRAM SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.;** **Mr. JOHN COFFEY;** **Mr. HENRAGE E. B. HARRISON, B.A.;** **Mr. JEREMIAH HENLY;** **Mr. WALTER MCMURDOUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.;** **Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL KITTLE, B.L.;** and

Mr. ANTHONY J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

MR. MICHAEL O'MAHONY, Principal of Mohober National School, County Tipperary, examined.

18948. The CHAIRMAN.—You are principal teacher of Mohober national school, county Tipperary?—Yes.

18949. How long have you been principal?—Since the 1st of January, 1901, in that school.

18951. Twelve years in that school?—Yes, and one year and five months as principal in Ballingarry school before that.

18952. And before that?—I was assistant from 1887 in Windgap school, county Kilkenny.

18953. You have been in the service of the Board since 1887?—Yes, the 1st of July, 1887.

18954. And you were in Mohober when the new system was introduced?—Just immediately after the change.

18955. What was your grading or classification under the old system?—First of second class.

18956. How were you treated under the new system as regards that?—Very badly, I must say.

18957. What was your grade under the new system?—I got third grade, but less salary than I had as assistant.

18958. Just confine yourself to the transition from the old system to the new?—I was given my predecessor's salary in Mohober national school.

18959. On the average of three years?—Yes; first, which was gradually raised, and I got increment after increment then, with no adverse report, until I got the maximum of third grade, and then I got promotion in due course, and now I am at the maximum of second grade. I got compensation.

18960. What is the maximum salary of the second grade?—£107.

18961. Well, you had a succession of "very good" reports?—I had all through.

18962. Down to 1910?—Yes, up to Mr. Welpy's coming, in 1910-11.

18963. Mr. COFFEY.—You had all the marks "excellent"?—No; seven "very goods."

18964. All "very goods"?—Yes.

18965. The CHAIRMAN.—And you got your increment in due course all through?—In due course, all through.

18966. And what is the average attendance of your present school?—I think it was 49 for the past year—48 and some decimal.

18967. But you have risen somewhat above that?—I have risen now, I think, to 54 or 55; I could not tell you the exact number.

18968. But your numbers would not allow you to be promoted to the first?—They would now, but not for the past year, as the annual average was under 50.

18969. They would now?—Yes; because the attendance has increased.

18970. Is it likely to increase?—At the present time I have 73 on the rolls, and we have no difficulty in getting an average of 50.

18973. You say you never got an adverse report from the date of your appointment until Mr. Welpy examined your school?—Yes, until the lowering of the merit mark of my school by the senior inspector, Mr. Welpy, in 1911.

18972. 7th of April, 1911?—Yes, the lowering of the merit mark without just cause.

18973. Have you any remark to make about that?—I have certain reasons to show that his lowering was unjust.

18974. It would be better now if you would put in the merit marks that you received from 1901 till 1912, and you have them in your pocket?—Yes. For the year 1901-02 Mr. O'Riordan gave "good" (which corresponds to the present "very good," because there was no "very good" then); for 1902-03, Mr. Brown, senior inspector, gave "very good"; 1903-04, Mr. Brown, "very good"; 1904-05, Mr. Brown, "very good"; 1905-06, Mr. Brown, "very good"; 1906-07, Mr. McNulty, "very good"; 1907-08, same inspector, "very good"; 1908-09, same inspector, "very good"; 1909-10, Mr. Fitzpatrick, "very good." Then, for the first time, a break—1910-11, Mr. Welpy, senior inspector, "fair"; 1911-12, Mr. P. J. FitzGerald, "good," and later on I had Mr. Dowling, who awarded "good."

18976. That is 1912-13?—Yes, Mr. Dowling visited on the 5th of March.

18977. And his mark was "good"?—Was "good."

18978. That completes your record?—Yes, as Principal in Mohober National School.

18979. Now, you want to tell us on what grounds you impudently the award of Mr. Welpy in 1911. You have set them out in some detail in this pocket?—The first point is—"He did not examine my school fully." (2) He did not question me about or refer to the roll book to ascertain irregular attendance. (3) He based his report on reading from his examination of infants, and six boys out of a possible fourteen pupils in third and fourth standards. (4) He asked no child from the other standards to read. (5) He marked grammar as being "intelligently taught" from his testing of the six boys referred to in analysis, and to whom he gave what I deem catchy sentences, for example—"Little Selanta gave the bull a stroke of his harrier." I have met inspectors who differ widely in analyzing simple sentences. I often sought for information on the kind of analysis the inspector required, whom I expected for the annual inspection.

18979A. Have you any remarks to make on that to amplify it, or does that express all that you wish to convey to us?—In his examination in grammar he did not discriminate between the third and fourth standards, and he selected sentences himself from the readers, and told the children "Analyze them," and I think that was a rather peculiar way of testing small children in analysis. There is another point, that Mr. Welpy did not consult the progress record during that examination, and he took children on matters they had not done, and did not mind whether they were taught so far in any subject or not.

18980. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—Did he ask you what progress they had made?—Not during that inspection.

18981. The CHAIRMAN.—Then, about Mr. Welpy's discourtesy. You say—"Several times while the pupils were engaged at work Mr. Welpy treated the assistant and myself in an ungentlemanly way by addressing us rudely in presence of our pupils. His manner during the whole time he was in my school was of that bullying type which instils fear or provokes insubordination. When the pupils were dismissed he completely lost his self-control when I stated, that one thing he condemned in my school was his own

24th July, 1918.]

Mr. MICHAEL O'MAHONY continued.

[Continued.]

suggestion. He stamped on the floor and declared it "absolutely impossible." That refers to the use of slates?—Yes.

18982. You had understood him to recommend you to introduce them?—Yes, to introduce slates to some of the junior infants.

18983. He states that what he recommended was the use of pencils?—No, that is not true, because as a matter of fact I had no slate work since the previous examination—that of Mr. Fitzpatrick. I have it here in the observation book that Mr. Fitzpatrick told me to discontinue the use of slates, and I adopted his suggestion, and Mr. Welply came in the October following that April, and he said to me, seeing the helpless efforts made by some of the junior infants, that we had, writing on paper, with lead pencils, "Wouldn't it be better that these children should use slates till they can properly manage the pencil, or can understand the proper holding of the pencil."

18984. And you say deliberately that Mr. Welply recommended to you on that occasion the use of slates?—For the junior infants, certainly. Mr. Chairman, I have not the least doubt of it.

18985. The whole point is that Mr. Welply recommended the use of slates. Do you say that deliberately?—I say it without hesitation, because he did not see slates in use at all in my school at the time.

18986. And you say—"The assistant who was present when he made the suggestion the previous October respectfully corroborated my assertion, and Mr. Welply most rudely replied—"You were not, Madam."?—Yes; in fact I did not know what he meant, and I believe he did not know very well what he meant, himself.

18987. From the state of his temper?—Yes; I was afraid he would collapse in a fit. It was perfectly unbecoming.

18988. Were the children present?—No; the children were let off. He began when the examination was over. He said—"These are my notes; I will read them for you," not, as he stated in his letter, that I read them (he did not let me see into the Observation Book at all). The first thing he read was—"Infants write and draw on slates," and he said that he had directed that this should not go on, "You did not, sir," I said, "You suggested it," and he immediately got into a state of temper, and stood up and said—"That is absolutely impossible." That is untrue, because I had no slate work in use at the time of his incidental visit, and it was seeing the feeble efforts of the children on paper that caused him to suggest the use of slates for these junior children.

18989. And you confirm that deliberately?—Certainly, sir, I do without any hesitation; I would be prepared to swear it.

18990. Mr. CORRY.—You had been using slates, and you discontinued them on the suggestion of Mr. Fitzpatrick?—Yes, that is so.

18991. And acting on his advice you got paper?—Yes, only paper work alone.

18992. And there were no slates whatever in use in your school?—No, except with lower standards at boys' arithmetic.

18993. The CHAIRMAN.—And then Mr. Welply recommended you to return to slates?—For the junior infants. Well, at the examination he gave me letters to put on the blackboard for the children to write. I had a good many of the children writing on paper, all in fact of the senior infants, and there was only a small proportion of junior infants that used slates. Mr. Welply could clearly see these children working on slates, both writing and drawing, and he never made the slightest remark to me about it. Had he said "Why don't you supply paper?" I would certainly have changed it because it was paper work they were accustomed to use.

18994. You say—"He made no allowance whatsoever for the restlessness of childhood. He got them seated on forms, their backs to a cold wall, and left them so for nearly two hours. If one of them spoke a word or stirred feet on the floor he showed he was highly displeased."?—Yes, that is quite true.

18995. Then you say—"Three or four erred in this respect. One of these had seven attendances in the

preceding nine months. It was the fourth day of the other child in the school"?—Yes, that is true.

18996. And he noticed the behaviour of the infants in the report on your school?—Yes.

18997. Now, as to your opinion of the reading. You say—"Two of the six deserved E. The other four were naturally dull and irregular attenders. They deserved at least F. The great majority of the infants were reading first standard book and deserved E, and I believe they would get it from any other inspector. My 5th and 6th standards were excellent"?—Yes.

18998. Then you say—"While I am teacher my school was never so efficient as in 1911 when Mr. Welply rewards my efforts with 'fair.' If he were right then all the other inspectors who visited my school incidentally or for examination were wrong, for I have no hesitation in declaring that my school was better in 1911 than in any of the preceding years I expected 'Excellent.' I got 'fair.'?—Yes, that is correct.

18999. Now, about Dr. Starkie's visit. He visited the school in the following October?—Yes.

19000. Now, will you tell me something about that visit of Dr. Starkie, who was requested by the Board to see the state of this circuit?—Yes.

Mr. CORRY.—That is Dr. Starkie's statement, that he was requested by the Board, but we have it in the evidence of Mr. Ward that he was aware of no such direction from the Board.

Mr. HENLY.—And Dr. Starkie stated that he was not requested by the Board, but by some of his colleagues.

The BISHOP OF ROSK.—He says that the idea did not originate with him, but with some of his colleagues, and then he had the recommendation of some of his colleagues.

19001. The CHAIRMAN.—At any rate you knew the object of his visiting the district?—I did; I was aware of it, and he asked for the children who read for Mr. Welply. Luckily I had five out of the six present, and he got these children that were present to read. They were half the length of the school away from him, and he said to them "read any lesson you like," and they selected a lesson, and they read for him. He remarked, "And these are the children that Mr. Welply stated read indifferently"—I think he used the word "characterised."

19002. Give us, without any comment, the words which Dr. Starkie used with regard to these children?—And these are the children who read indifferently for Mr. Welply."

19003. What did you infer from that remark?—That he would not agree with Mr. Welply. Then he said—"Get some of the girls to read." The girls read, and they read better than the boys. His remark was that "The girls can read better than the boys." I had some boys present who, I said, I thought would do better than the girls.

19004. Did you tell him that?—Yes, and I got out of the boys to read, and he said—"That will do." Mr. DeWorth went round, and questioned some of the children in mental arithmetic.

19005. All that Dr. Starkie said at that point was—"That will do"?—Yes; and then he asked me what steps did I take in the memorial business in the county Tipperary, and I said I took none, that I merely attended a meeting in Tipperary. The movement was on foot long before my school was examined, that I was aware of it the previous Christmas, and as a result of Mr. Welply's examination I attended the meeting, and I handed in my report. He asked me had I any copy of that, and I said I had and I let him see it. He took several notes from my written report, something similar to that, that you have at present.

19006. That is all that happened at that visit?—That is all, except that Mrs. Starkie questioned about cookery and school gardening. She seemed to be interested in cookery. We had it introduced two years before that, and we discontinued it owing to the report that Mr. Welply gave regarding the cookery business. We did it at a great sacrifice in a one-room school, and it interfered very much.

I must say, with the ordinary course of business, and seeing the report that Mr. Welpy gave, stating that unless the efficiency in cookery would be something better in future the fees would be withdrawn—well, we did not adopt it since.

1907. You have given it up?—We have given up cookery.

1908. In consequence of that remark?—Well, not altogether. In consequence of the inconvenience of the school. A one-roomed school is not suited for cookery.

1909. The Honor of Ross.—It seems to be a boys and girls' school?—Yes.

1910. Under fifty; and have you an assistant mistress in the school?—Yes, my wife is assistant mistress. We had over fifty at the time of her appointment.

1911. The CHAIRMAN.—And you do not lose an assistant if the average falls below fifty?—It must go under forty now to cancel her appointment.

1912. Is that all you can tell us about Dr. Starke's visit?—That is all.

1913. Mr. COFFEY.—Did Dr. Starke ask you any question about the alleged rudeness of Mr. Welpy in the school?—No, not directly, till he saw my notes, and then he questioned me about it, and then I gave him a full explanation of it, something similar to what I have told you at present. He had it in my written notes, and took notes of the state incident, and the loss of temper, and the way he addressed the mistress and myself on two occasions.

1914. The CHAIRMAN.—Do I understand that you told Dr. Starke all you have told us about the rudeness of the inspector?—Yes, decidedly.

1915. Go on to Mr. Hynes's visit. He visited about the same time?—Yes, and examined the school.

1916. What was your idea of Mr. Hynes's going to visit the school—he being the Chief Inspector?—He was Chief Inspector, and I expected that he went there to find fault with us, to corroborate Mr. Welpy's opinion of our school.

1917. It was in consequence of Mr. Welpy's report?—Yes, that, I expect, was the cause of it.

1918. Have you any remark to make about his examination of your school?—I have. It was a little after Dr. Starke's visit. Mr. Hynes seemed to dwell very much on the reading of the class examined both by Dr. Starke and Mr. Welpy, and also on the grammar of the 3rd and 4th children, as well as the 5th and 6th.

1919. Is it your impression that Mr. Hynes directed his examination to those points where Mr. Welpy had found fault?—Yes, it is.

1920. He directed his attention to those points?—He directed his attention to those points.

1921. Where fault was found by Mr. Welpy?—Yes, with those standards.

1922. And your idea was that he came there to test the value of the report?—Yes.

1923. That was your idea?—Yes.

1924. Is there anything more?—There is. When the examination by Mr. Hynes was over, and the children dismissed I asked him if he pleased to tell me his opinion of our school, and his reply was—"You are doing very good work here," whereas I found afterwards when the Blue Book was published that he gave our school only a "weak good." What he told me in the presence of my assistant was that we were doing very good work, so that his report to the Board is quite inconsistent.

1925. I have it here in the Appendix, page 215—"Meagher school," good (weak). The previous mark was fair?—Yes, after we had got seven preceding "V.G.'s." And there is another point, namely, the difference between inspectors. Mr. Hynes examined very differently in grammar from Mr. McEnery or other inspectors. When he gave a sentence he would not take anything but the verb, and analyse that as predicate, and my children were always taught to take the object and take the complete doing of the whole thing as the predicate, and

Mr. Hynes said—"That is not what it ought to be; what is predicate is the verb," and only the verb he would take.

The CHAIRMAN.—We could not possibly go into all those minute points.

1926. Mr. HENRY.—In the Notes for Teachers it is stated distinctly that the sentence is to be divided into two parts, and that all that is not subject is predicate; and therefore Mr. Hynes was asking them to analyse on a principal which is condemned by the Board?—Yes.

1927.—The CHAIRMAN.—That is what you want to bring out?—Yes, that is what I want to bring out.

1928. Have you any record in the book of Mr. Hynes's report?—Mr. Hynes did not write anything in the book.

1929. Was any report sent to you by the Board?—No, never about his visit.

1930. You say that Mr. Welpy at his examination did not refer to the roll book to see the attendance?—Yes.

1931. Now, about Mr. Welpy's "unseen reading test," will you explain what you say is the unfavourable of it?—Yes; his unseen reading test. I maintain that it is unfair to open a book the children had not previously seen, and give it into the hands of a child and say—"Read there." The reason I think that unfair to a child is that the child cannot properly emphasise the words, or bring out the direct sense that the passage conveys, without first being allowed to glance through a portion of it.

1932. Did he not allow time for that?—No, not one moment; merely took the book and said—"Read there," indicating some particular place, and then to another child—"Read there." I understood that at his last examination of King's scholars in Waterford he handed slips of paper round, and told them to look at them before reading. He did not deal with the King's scholars in Waterford in the way that he dealt with the senior boys in our school.

1933. Is that part of the charge, that he hurried the children?—Yes.

1934. Now, about Mr. Fitzpatrick's wrong statement in the observation book?—Yes, the first note was—"Wash basin, soap and towel required," whereas we had them in school, and at Mr. Welpy's subsequent visit (incidentally) I pointed out that to him, and Mr. Welpy cancelled that himself.

1935. And then the suggestion of writing on slates to be discontinued for paper. You objected that?—Yes. And then he says—"Very short pencils not to be used." What he means I do not know.

1936. Now, you have told us all about Dr. Starke's visit in October, 1911?—Yes, I think so.

1937. And you have covered all about the visit of Mr. Hynes?—Yes.

1938. You refer to Mr. P. J. Fitzgerald's observations in the observation book contradicting Mr. Welpy's statement—"The teachers of this school are guilty of great neglect"?—He says the pupils are industrious and well behaved, and reading was well taught except to the infants.

1939. What is the date of that?—18th of January, 1912. Again, he says—"Sound educational work is done here," on the 22nd of March, 1912, and—"The pupils are trained to speak well, and their intelligence is developed," whereas Mr. Welpy made quite a different report.

1940. Mr. COFFEY.—That is Mr. Fitzgerald?—Yes.

1941. A brother of the senior inspector?—Yes.

1942. The CHAIRMAN.—And your point is that in his report he contradicts the allegation of Mr. Welpy?—Yes. Mr. Welpy said the children were not trained to speak or to answer distinctly, and Mr. Fitzgerald in the following year states that the pupils are trained to speak well, and their intelligence is developed.

1943. You refer next to Mr. Welpy's incidental visit of the 28th of September, 1910. You say—"He found a monitor under instruction at 9.15, and this showed no neglect of duty"?—Certainly. He came in on a very wet morning, as

26th July, 1918.]

Mr. MICHAEL O'HANNOY examined.

[Continued.]

extremely wet morning, riding a bicycle, and I had a monitor under instruction at that hour of the morning, and which showed no neglect of duty on my part.

19044. Mr. CORRY.—Did he say that you were too early at work?—No. Furthermore, Mr. Welby seemed quite surprised. He said—"You have a monitor," and appeared not to know that I had a monitor at all.

19045. What observation did he make in the observation book?—25th of September—"Junior writing needs increased attention."

19046. The CHAIRMAN.—Go on to the monitor?—Nothing at all about the monitor in that, till the 7th of the 4th following. (He made no remark about the monitor in that visit) when he says—"The monitor has learned only 55 lines of poetry so far, and he is weak in his knowledge of geometry."

19047. The BISHOP or ROSS.—What was the date of that?—The 7th of April, 1911.

19048. Mr. CORRY.—He did not charge you with doing anything wrong in instructing your monitor at 9.15?—No, he did not; but he did afterwards in his letter to the Board, where he said that the monitor failed completely in geometry, whereas Mr. Welby outstepped his programme.

19049. The CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Welby went beyond the programme?—He did, and I have the programme here to prove it.

19050. Then, as to how you deal with this criticism, you say the monitor succeeded at his examination in 1911?—He did.

19051. Then, you refer to a statement of the monitor regarding his examination by Mr. Welby in 1911?—I have it here. I wrote to him to the Training College, and this is what he says—"Mr. Welby, senior inspector, examined me on the various subjects prescribed in second year monitors' course in 1911. It is not true that I failed completely in geometry. He asked me to work proposition 48 of the first, and the 12th of the 3rd, the latter of which is not specified in the programme, and which I did not work. I worked the former correctly." (I have the programme here to show you.) "With regard to the poetry which I learned from the 'Merchant of Venice,' I could easily get off the required number of lines in a few days, and therefore I gave scarcely all my time to more difficult subjects. I cannot recollect correctly the number of exercises in arithmetic, which Mr. Welby asked me to do, but I know I failed to do a question in Stocks, and, however, though I failed in that exercise, I feel I passed all right in that subject, and in the remaining ones of the programme." That is the monitor's statement.

19052. Is there a good character from the superior of De la Salle?—Yes, and some of the children who left my school got on well elsewhere.

19053. The statement that your pupils got on well has no bearing on the point, has it?—I thought it might have, owing to the charge of Mr. Welby that I neglected my duty.

19054. You had the annual inspection by Mr. Dowling in 1913?—Yes.

19055. What have you to say about the annual inspection of Mr. Dowling?—He gave me the mark "good," and he says—"There is a good spirit of work, and evidence of sound training in many directions. Suggestions. In reading and speaking a little animation is at times desirable. Then car test regarding singing." Now, regarding the reading of the infants, according to the Notes we are supposed to teach infants principally from blackboard. Well, in accordance with that we have always a morning lesson on the blackboard for infants, and a later lesson in the day from their infant readers, and Mr. Dowling happened to be late that morning and missed the lesson that was given to the infants. Then afterwards the assistant teacher grouped the infants together and tablets were used, and he condemned that; and he wrote that tablets are undesirable when teaching infants, and plenty of blackboard work is the thing.

19056. What do you want to make of all this?—Mr. Dowling told me that he would give the school

"very good" were it not for the reading of the infants, and for the 5th and 6th standards being weak in geography. I do not know whether you are aware of the class of questions in geography that some inspectors ask, and if you can for it I will give you some of the questions. Here is one:—"If I went to the North of France what might I find the people principally engaged in there," or "Chiefly employed at or engaged in there?"

19057. Mr. CORRY.—Was that Mr. Dowling?—That was Mr. Dowling.

19058. Mr. KERR.—What would be the ages of the children?—Fifth and 6th standard children from ten to twelve years. And "If I went to the West of France what might I find the people engaged in?" The children did not tell him about the North of France, but they said about the West—"Wine industry." Then he said—"What kind of wine," "What are the towns that export it?" "Who is the King of France?" "What do you call a country governed without a King?" "Who is the new President lately elected in America?" And that was geography. And all I could say was "The lines that you examine my children on are new and I am not surprised they do not answer well in geography."

19059. The CHAIRMAN.—I think it is your point that the mark he gave you was due to his faulty examination in this subject?—I would not say faulty examination.

19060. Well what would you say—would you say want of proper examination?—Yes, it was on new lines. I would not say faulty examination.

19061. Mr. KERR.—Would you say unusual?—Yes, unusual lines. The mark he gave me I should say was certainly influenced by the previous mark of Mr. Welby, because he was not at liberty to raise it.

19062. He did not raise it?—No, Mr. FitzGerald raised it.

19063. The BISHOP or ROSS.—Was Mr. FitzGerald a senior at the time?—A junior inspector.

19064. But he raised the mark?—He raised Mr. Welby's "fair" to "good."

19065. Why could not the other have raised it from "good" to "excellent"?—Not without Mr. Welby's sanction, I am sure.

19066. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, there was something in your observation book on the occasion of the incidental visit of Mr. Welby on the 14th of March, 1913?—"The pupils are bright and cheerful, and the general condition of this school is much better than when I saw it previously."

19067. When did he see it before that?—On the 7th of April, 1911.

19068. So that was more than a year?—Just two years.

19069. The last remark you have is about the ill effect of Mr. Welby's examination of April 7th, 1911, on the teachers and children. Can you explain what you mean by that?—The assistant and I were completely collapsed after Mr. Welby's visit. We had done good honest work, as all previous inspectors were able to judge, and Mr. Welby's report as disheartened us that it was impossible to teach effectively afterwards. We felt it was useless to teach with such poor encouragement as Mr. Welby gave us, and the strain was terrible while he was with us.

19070. Did it produce lasting effects?—For a certain period at any rate.

19071. The disheartenment?—The disheartenment.

19072. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—What do I understand is the result to yourself of Mr. Welby's action—have you lost increment?—Promotion would be due to me. I am at the maximum of second grade and promotion would be due to me from the 1st of April last twelve months, were it not for not happening to get three "V.G.s." I saw it stated in the Blue Book that I should get three "V.G.s." I had one "V.G." got from Mr. FitzGerald, and Mr. Welby gives me "fair," and that knocks me

out again. That knocks me down indefinitely. Since then I have got two "G's" and I distribute those two "G's" to Mr. Welpy's "fair."

19072. And if you had got two more "V.G.'s" after the seven that you did get, what would be the effect?—I would now be in first grade from the 1st of April last twelve months, if the Commissioners overlooked the point that I am not trained. That is another bar.

19073. The CHAIRMAN.—You are not trained?—I am not trained.

19074. Sir HUBERT WILKINSON.—What would the additional emolument be?—£10 a year for three years, and then another rise of £10 more; and also it further deprived my assistant of the necessary seven "V.G.'s" for promotion. She is a trained teacher.

19075. How many V.G.'s "does she require for promotion?—I saw it stated in the Blue Book that seven "V.G.'s" would be needed.

19076. Mr. HENLY.—I think it is six "V.G.'s" 1—Six or seven, I forget which.

19077. Sir HUBERT WILKINSON.—Your assistant is deprived also?—Yes, of the necessary conditions for promotion. Six successive "V.G.'s" would be necessary for her promotion.

19078. Do you know at the moment how many she had got?—I do not. Of course they are valueless owing to "fair" coming in.

19079. Do you know whether she got "fair" as well as the school?—I do not know her personal mark; we are never acquainted with the personal mark given. I understand there may be a different mark for the principal, a different mark from the one for the assistant, which may differ from the mark of the school. For all I know she may have got "very good" while the school was marked "fair."

19080. But if there had not been some lowering of her mark, in her case, would the new have received promotion?—I think so; I think it would be due to her.

19081. But you are not quite positive?—I am not quite positive about it.

19082. But the point that you make out with regard to yourself is that from three different inspectors you got seven "V.G.'s" 1—I beg your pardon, four different inspectors.

19083. Mr. BROWN, Mr. McNEERY, and Mr. FITZGERALD 1—And previous to that there was no "V.G.," but I had "G." from Mr. O'Riordan which equalled "V.G."

19084. You mean that "G." then was equal to "V.G." afterwards?—Yes.

19085. Well, counting the "G." as equal to "V.G." you had nine "V.G.'s" from four different inspectors?—Yes.

19086. And then Mr. Welpy came in and reduced you two points, and made your school "fair" 1—"Fair."

19087. And you say there was no deterioration 1—No, because I know my school was better. I had heard a very bad report of Mr. Welpy's inspections, and we worked harder that year.

19088. Mr. HARRISON.—Now, tell me this. You say that as the result of Mr. Welpy's award you lost the chance of an increment 1—I lost promotion.

19089. You lost the chance of promotion 1—Yes, and increment.

19090. Then, as a result of Mr. Hyman's visit did you get any redress 1—Oh no, I did not.

19091. Now, one other point. You say—"Mr. Welpy reduced me from a 'very good' to a 'fair.' Was that the result of his first visit to your school?—No, his second visit; the first was incidental.

19092. It may be said to have been the result of two visits 1—It might be. His first was merely incidental.

19093. Do you know any other case in which such a drastic reduction was made as from "very good" to "fair" 1—Oh, we have several all round in Tipperary. 19094. You know other cases with as drastic a reduction as that?—Yes.

19095. Now, I want to see the report upon which that reduction was based. Will you kindly read the full report 1—"The general proficiency is not nearly so good as it seems to have been previously. Reading

is devoid of taste and expression. Grammar is unintelligently taught, and the infants do not receive adequate attention. Above all the pupils are not trained to speak audibly and distinctly. More should be done too in geography. In singing, needle work, and history the progress shown was good on the whole. A more definite division of work between the teachers is desirable."

19096. Is there anything there about discipline, or the general bearing of the children 1—No, except in the observation book.

19097. There is nothing of that in the report 1—No.

19098. There is nothing of what the National Board terms "tone" 1—No.

19099. Mr. HENLY.—Have you read the whole report 1—I have, as received from the office.

19100. Mr. HARRISON.—And all those statements are very general statements, are they not?—Yes.

19101. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Can you give the observations in the observation book relative to that report that you have just read 1—"General inspection, 7:4:11. From twenty past eleven to 3.15. Forty-five percent. Accompanied by Miss Kelly. Infants write and draw on slates. This ought not to go on. I have always condemned this practice in every school. Reading, third and fourth, very lacking in taste and expression. Grammar analysis is not intelligently taught in the third and fourth standards. I did not see an object lesson, but I shall call for one at my next visit. The monitor has learned only 55 lines of poetry so far and is weak in his knowledge of geometry. Some of the infant pupils not amenable to discipline."

19102. Was that the only report you received from Mr. Welpy 1—That is the only report.

19103. Who succeeded him 1—Mr. F. J. FITZGERALD.

19104. And he raised your mark 1—Yes.

19105. What would be the ages of the children you describe as junior infants 1—From 3 to 6, according to their capabilities.

19106. And are they on the rolls 1—Yes, they are.

19107. They count 1—They count.

19108. In the register of 73 on the roll that you have at present 1—Yes.

19109. Is the School Attendance Act in force in your district 1—Yes, it is.

19110. Did you find an advantage from it 1—I did with a good many pupils.

19111. You are getting a better attendance now 1—Something better.

19112. Mr. KERR.—When you spoke of not being trained before entering on your career as a teacher did you mean not trained under the Board 1—Yes, not trained under the Board in a recognized Training college.

19113. What education had you, in fact, received 1—I was a monitor for 5 years and 9 months, and had 12 years' service along with a principal first class trained teacher.

19114. So your personal education was that obtained in a national school 1—Yes, in a national school, where I was a monitor for 5 years, and afterwards assistant in the same school for 12 years.

19115. That was before your appointment in 1887?—No, I was appointed assistant in 1887, but previous to 1887, I was monitor for 5 years and 9 months in the same school.

19116. With regard to the criticism of the reading I want to put a question to you. Do you think that a provincial accent in reading may lead an inspector who has another accent to give a lower mark 1—I am sure it does.

19117. Can you tell me what sort of accent Mr. Welpy has 1—I never heard him read.

19118. Well, but you heard him speak 1—I heard him speak.

19119. Mr. HENLY.—When did you enter the service 1—I was appointed assistant on the 1st of July, 1887.

19120. When did you become a principal 1—In May, 1889—12 years after.

19121. There was no rule then debarring you from becoming a principal 1—No, not at that time but there was since.

19132. Was there any rule barring you from promotion at that time?—That is a point that I am hazy about.

19133. Now, you got six or seven consecutive "very good" ?—I did.

19134. Now, in your opinion was your school as well taught and your pupils as proficient when Mr. Welpy visited as it had been in the previous years?—In my candid opinion my school was better.

19135. And then if Mr. Welpy's judgment of your school was accurate, the judgment of all the preceding inspectors must have been inaccurate?—Inaccurate, certainly.

19136. In other words, he adopted one standard and the other inspectors another?—Yes—well, I would not say that, but it was owing to Mr. Welpy's manner of examination of the children, his abrupt manner with them, that did not bring out from the children what they really knew. With an inspector like Mr. Brown or Mr. McNamara or Mr. Fitzgerald, or even Mr. Dowling since then, the children would answer much better than with Mr. Welpy. The children I am sure knew some of the things Mr. Welpy asked, but owing to his manner he made the children afraid of him, and the children would not answer. Of course you know that when children are frightened they will not show up their best.

19137. So that then you object as much to Mr. Welpy's manner in dealing with the children as you do to his standard?—I do not object to his standard at all—I mean his tests; his tests were not unfair. Any questions that he asked the children I would certainly be very pleased for any inspector to ask.

19138. You mean any other inspector?—Yes, any other inspector.

19139. He reduced your mark from "very good" to "fair"?—He did, sir.

19140. And notwithstanding that Mr. Hynes thought that it ought to be "good," that mark remained as the mark of your school for that year?—"Fair," and it has not been changed. For that particular year "fair" stands against me.

19141. And although you appealed, and although an inspector was sent to re-investigate the case, that mark still remains?—Yes make a statement that I do not agree with; I did not appeal; I made no individual appeal.

19142. Were you not one of those that signed that memorial?—I was.

19143. Was not that an appeal?—Well, it was not an individual appeal.

19144. I did not use the word "individual"?—I would have appealed individually, but my manager advised me to join in the general movement and I did so.

19145. Although the case was investigated both by Dr. Starcke and Mr. Hynes, still that mark remains?—Still the mark remains.

19146. We have it in evidence from Mr. Dillworth in answer to question 192, that these are the conditions for promotion to second section of first grade?—Six consecutive "very good" reports are required, and at least 15 years' service?—I think they are not the conditions.

19147. "For principal teachers in schools with an

average of over 30 and up to 60 if a teacher has three consecutive "very good" reports, and has at least six years' service he may be promoted to the second grade. The normal time for promotion to the second grade is twelve years. In schools with an average of 70 or above, three consecutive "very good" reports, and at least three years' service are required." At any rate you lost your chance of special promotion?—I think so.

19148. But apart altogether from any pecuniary loss, was it not an injury to you to have your mark reduced, from a professional point of view?—Certainly. What would my manager think, but that I really had neglected my duty though I had not.

19149. And you state here that you worked as hard and as efficiently for that year as in any previous year?—Yes, and worked harder, as I stated already.

19150. And therefore if there was anything approximating to uniformity in the standard of inspection you should have got "very good"?—Yes; my school was better that year than any previous year.

19151. Mr. COFFEY.—Will you read Mr. Fitzpatrick's report of the previous year, 1909-10?—Mr. Fitzpatrick in his report in the previous year says—"The schoolhouse made a favourable impression by its neatness, but it was not provided with offices or playground. A great amount of routine work is done, and on the whole the proficiency is good, but pupils require more practice in speaking at all oral lessons, so as to acquire clearness and confidence. There are no offices. A globe and adequate equipment for manual instruction are required."

19152. The BISHOP OF ROSK.—Was your school one of those mentioned in the memorial?—Yes, it was.

19153. The CHAIRMAN.—Is there anything you have left untouched that you would like us to know?—There is one point, about Mr. Brown being an easy examiner. I saw it is stated in the Blue Book. Well, Mr. Brown succeeded Mr. O'Riordan as the examiner of my school; Mr. O'Riordan gave me "very good" for reading (that is the particular portion that I refer to), and Mr. Brown in the succeeding year marked my school for reading "G." I had a few words with Mr. Brown on the matter, and I referred to Mr. O'Riordan's mark, and Mr. Brown said—"My standard is higher than Mr. O'Riordan's. Anywhere where he gave 'V.G.' I gave 'G.' and where he gave 'G.' I gave 'fair.'"

19154. What you mean is—?—That Mr. Brown was not an easy examiner.

19155. He was not too easy?—I would not say too easy at all, but I would say that that he was a conscientious examiner, because he would listen to an explanation from the teacher; and furthermore where there were irregular attendances he always took that into account.

19156. Was Mr. Brown one of those inspectors who advised you?—Yes.

19157. And conferred with you, and talked with you about the examination?—He did, sir, at all times when necessary arose.

19158. Mr. COFFEY.—His manner was more sympathetic than Mr. Welpy's?—Oh, yes, it was quite different.

Mr. PATRICK OWENS, B.A., late Principal of Roscrea National School, examined.

19159. The CHAIRMAN.—You were principal of Roscrea National School?—Yes.

19160. You are retired?—Since the 31st of March last year under the age rule.

19161. How long were you principal of Roscrea?—I was principal of Roscrea from 1890—practically sixteen years.

19162. And what was your classification under the previous system, before 1906?—Under the previous system I was first of first class.

19163. And what happened to you when the new system came in?—I was first of first grade.

19164. And can you give us any idea of the marking

of your school from 1900 down to 1909?—Perhaps, sir, if I give you shortly, my own history from the time I commenced under the Board up to recent events, I could do it in a few moments, and it will give you a better idea.

19165. Very well?—In the year 1872 I joined the Board's service, I was trained in 1863. I entered a secondary school in Dublin for nearly seven years, and I joined the Board's service again, and got a classification.

19166. In what year? In 1872 I entered the Board's service in Toomevara, in the diocese of Kildare.

19167. The Bazaar of Ross.—Were you principal at Templemore?—I was principal at Templemore, and this is what the Inspector said in his report when I was leaving the school:—"Mr. Owens leaves this school in a thorough state of efficiency, and it is to be hoped that his successor will endeavour to maintain it in that state." And this is what the manager said:—"Mr. P. Owens, Principal of Templemore Male National School, is a young man of the very highest merit as a teacher, a gentleman, and a practical Christian. Though his promotion to a more lucrative post will be a most serious loss to me and my flock, yet I shall be happy to see so deserving a young man well remunerated for his valuable services in the cause of education and religion. I am free to state that he is the very best instructor of youth I ever knew, or expect to ever to meet.—F. O'Leary, P.P." I came to Templemore in 1872, and left after four years and a half in 1876 to take charge of Templemore school. Now, I was twenty years in Templemore. By the way, four years after I entered the Board's service I obtained first division of first class.

19168-9. That was in 1876?—In 1876. After three years' service I had second division of first class, and then I had first of first, all within that four years.

19170. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Is not that a record?—Well, it was fairly creditable. This is what Mr. Sullivan, district inspector, said about me at the time:—"When in charge of district 43, 1884-5, Templemore Male National School was under my supervision, so that I was well acquainted with Mr. Patrick Owens, Principal teacher. I found Mr. Owens a skilful and very intelligent teacher, gifted with extraordinary energy, and most zealous in the discharge of his duty. By his skill and energy Mr. Owens has made his school one of the most useful in the South of Ireland. Mr. Owens' personal qualifications are of a high order, and his character is unimpeachable. His class as teacher is first of first." This is from Mr. Purser, late Chief of Inspection:—"I have much pleasure in stating that Mr. P. Owens, of Templemore national school is in every respect one of the most efficient teachers I have ever met with. His University degree and his numerous certificates from the Science and Art Department are sufficient proof of his superior literary and scientific attainments. I believe him capable of filling satisfactorily any position under the Board."

19171. The CHAIRMAN.—You did not tell us about your degree?—When the Royal University opened I had been intending to go to the London University and take my degree there, but the Royal University was then opened, and the very first year I matriculated.

19172. In what year did you take your degree?—In 1884.

19173. In 1884 you took your B.A.—Yes.

19174. What is the date of Mr. Purser's recommendation?—This was in 1887. Now, that is what the Inspector said. When I was leaving Templemore after twenty years I was presented with an illuminated address and a purse of over 160 sovereigns, and perhaps I might just read one paragraph of the address:—"Reviewing your public and private life of so long a period it is difficult to do the barest justice to your merits without the appearance of exaggeration. During this long residence amongst us you have had the chief and largest share of enlightening the minds, forming the character and shaping the destinies of thousands of boys. Braving what is meant by education and what it ought to be, recognising always that for the boys of to-day the morrow's manhood was rapidly approaching with its duties and responsibilities, you did not make the education a mere dry book work, you made it what it ought to be—a thorough guidance for the youthful mind and heart in the way in which they ought to go. That you have satisfactorily fulfilled your high mission is cordially endorsed by the whole community as well as amply established by the great success of your work. Thanks to your ability, unwearying energy, and unrelenting care a very

large number of your pupils have attained to and are at present creditably fulfilling distinguished positions in every walk of life, having gone directly thereto from your hands without the vast expenditure entailed on less fortunate parents by a college education." That was when I was leaving Templemore in the year 1896.

19175. To go to Rosera?—To go to Rosera. 19176. Now proceed to the next point?—In Rosera I worked on the resultsystem for four or five years. Now, during that time the results fees were of course the principal test of a teacher's ability. And I worked at the results fees till the new system came out in 1900.

19177. How did the new system affect your income?—Well, it did not affect my income at all. Of course I retained my income. I was not quite up to the highest salary of first of first grade. One increment brought me up to it, and of course I got that increment.

19178. Under the new system?—Under the new system.

19179. So that you have been all these years getting the highest salary?—Getting the highest salary.

19180. Mr. HEALY.—Was there any fault found with your work at all, during that period from 1896 till the new system came in?—No, never; my work was always praised by the different inspectors that I had since 1900.

19181. The CHAIRMAN.—I thought you might be able to give us the marks of your school for nine years?—Yes, I can do that.

19182. Can you give us a list of the merit marks?—Yes, that is what I mean. First of all I should state this, that my school is a very large building with six rooms in it. Of course every class has its own teacher, and its own work, and during all this time I took charge of the senior boys—4th, 5th, and 7th standards—which were of course the largest standards. I invariably made it a rule since I commenced to teach, that I would always take the children who were about to face the world. I had perhaps a foolish idea that none of the staff could do it as well as I could, and I thought they were the most deserving. I always paid particular attention to them, and took over charge of them, except of course for occasional lessons like music and things of that kind, I always had them under my charge. Under the new system there was nobody that ever found fault with my own personal work until Mr. Weply came on the scene.

19183. In 1910?—In 1910. No one found fault it during the whole course of my career.

19184. Give us the date of his first visit to your school?—His first visit to the school was in December, 1910. He came one day before that, but it was a fair day, and he only remained about half an hour looking over the books.

19185. In December, 1910?—He examined the school on the 5th of December, 1910.

19186. Did he give it a complete examination?—He went practically through the school, the lower classes particularly; very little in the upper classes but in the lower classes he did.

19187. What was the mark that he gave you in consequence of that?—I could not tell you.

19188. But the mark of the school?—I could not give you the mark as I could not get any report—never saw it till this day; and Mr. Weply when he came on a visit with Dr. Sharkey asked me where was the report, his last report. I told him I never got it. You did," said he, "I saw it on my last visit." No, sir," said I, "You did not see it on your last visit, because neither the manager nor myself ever got it. If I get it the manager would get it."

19189. Mr. HEALY.—They are sent in duplicate? They are sent in duplicate, of course. He accused me actually of falsehood.

19190. The CHAIRMAN.—Who did?—Mr. Weply. He told me he saw it in the books the last time he was there. Now, till to-day I don't know what it is.

19191. But under Mr. Weply was your mark reduced?—He filled three pages of the observation book, and complained particularly of two assistants.

24th July, 1913.]

Mr. PATRICK OWENS, B.A., examined.

[Continued.]

My personal work was not complained of, but two of my assistants were, and after the examination he brought the staff in to one of the rooms and he attacked these two assistants, made a furious attack on them, and lost his temper completely. Now, if there is one thing more than another that a teacher should cultivate it is good temper. If a teacher loses his temper I always believe that he loses ground as a teacher, and I think if a teacher should preserve his temper an inspector should be doubly expected to do. He gave a very bad exhibition of bad temper there that day.

19102. Had he listened to those teachers giving lessons?—He had, sir.

19103. And it was on that ground?—Yes. I do not object to him complaining in the slightest degree, but there is a different way of doing it. The teachers will not be driven, but they can be led. Mr. Welby would drive them. That is my candid opinion of him. I believe he is an earnest, hard-working able man, and that he means well, but he is setting about it in a wrong way, that is my experience as an old teacher.

19104. But you personally had not anything to complain of?—No, except this. I had a great complaint. He examined the monitors. Now, as will often happen, you will get very indifferent material in some of these cases. One of those monitors happened to meet with an accident, and he was nearly six months in bed, scarcely able to do anything. Another, as the manager told me afterwards, never intended to be a teacher, and he was only waiting to finish time to join the police; and the third was not a boy of mine, he was from a secondary school. Now he examined these, and he sent a report up to the Board, and a letter came down from the Board stating that my conduct was highly discreditable owing to the neglect of teaching my monitors. Now, I need not tell you, gentlemen, with my long service, that I was stung to the quick on getting that letter.

19105. Would you call that a reprimand from the Board?—It was not put as a reprimand. The manager was to state to me that in the opinion of the Board my conduct was highly discreditable.

19106. Mr. HENLY.—Have you the letter there?—The manager got the letter.

19107. The CHAIRMAN.—I should have called that a reprimand?—I considered it a very severe reprimand.

19108. Mr. HARRISON.—It does not follow that it is Mr. Welby's reprimand; it might have come from one of the officials.

19109. Mr. HENLY.—It might have come from one of the examiners?—I wrote there and then to Dr. Starke. I gave him a short résumé of my character since I joined the service of the Board, and I said that I felt I was treated exceedingly badly coming to the end of my time, to get such a letter as that, and asked to have it withdrawn, telling him the circumstances of the case; and I got a letter back from Mr. Wyse, the Secretary, stating that Dr. Starke had carefully looked into this business, and that he was sorry he could not see his way to withdraw the letter. In other words, I was to be a good boy for the future.

19110. The CHAIRMAN.—How long was that before your retirement?—This happened in the month of March.

19111. 1911?—Yes, 1911. That was the day he came to the school to examine the monitors. And by the way, I have something to say about that visit also.

19112. Mr. CORRY.—I think we may take it that that was the only reprimand or censure you ever got?—That I ever got from the Board. Now, on the day that he came to examine the monitors, he came in his motor car. He left the motor car 100 yards or 120 yards away from the school, and got out. I was told by the people living in the place, that he almost ran up to the school. I came down, a woman had come to me about a boy, and I came down the stairs. I was standing at the balustrade of the stairs talking about this child with the woman, when a man in a white coat rushed past me, upstairs, and did not say

good morning, or anything like that. I went up after him, and I found that he rushed into every room, all round about as quickly as he possibly could without saying good morning or anything else. Now, he never introduced himself, never told me who he was, and the first thing was to go to the desk, and without asking me anything, to pull out all the books. I did not like that sort of work. I think that an inspector should respect his teachers, and that he should remember that it is the teachers who are doing the work, and that the inspectors are merely there to see that the work is done, and to give them every encouragement and assistance in doing it; and that the very first thing that they should do when there is so much talk of tone now, would be to show a little of it when they come in themselves. Well, gentlemen, I could afford to ignore all these things; the people with whom I live know me and respect me, and I am sure, my Lord Bishop, that my manager, Archdeacon Stewart, can tell you that there is no man in Roscrea who has been more respected than I have been always. I could afford therefore to ignore this, but seeing that it is generally alleged by the inspectors in office that the present system of education is improving the country, I consider it my duty to come here and to state to you clearly my opinion that it is ruining the education of the country. The teachers round about me (and I speak now from what I know of the teachers round about me who have always respected me, and who would always come to me in any little difficulty, and speak to me in confidence) the teachers I say are worried—teachers of thirty and perhaps thirty-five years' service, who were never trained, but who did good work under the results system; but since the new system came out with this new fangled nature study and object lessons and kindergarten and all those things the very lives are worried out of them. I know the hobby of the inspector in my late school is weeds, and if I go into my school I see the windows littered over with withered leaves of different kinds of weeds. The infants of the first class in my school, I let out at half past two, and they are kept in now from 10 till 3, that is four and a half hours, including a half-hour's play. During that 4½ hours there are 20 minutes allotted to spelling and reading. Now, gentlemen, if you ask me what they are doing in the rest of the time, in my opinion at all events, the greater part of it is tombology, and in the last report of the school it is said that the school is now run upon right lines (when I was got rid of, I suppose). In my opinion the present system of inspection will never do. I would certainly go in, as an experienced teacher meet for examination. I do not know what the dread of abuse of examination was based on recently; I do not think a good searching examination ever did anyone any harm, and I know it will be an assistance to the teacher because an examiner will take a different view of different subjects from what the teacher will take. The teacher may have one particular groove, and the inspector will take him out of that groove, and I think it will serve the children also, and will enable him to find out their proficiency much better than if the teacher alone examined them. And besides, after all it is the only proof of work—the answering at an examination. Now, an inspector comes in, and he walks about with a pencil and notebook, in his hand, like Paul Pry, going from one class to another, going round, and in nine cases out of ten the poor unfortunate teacher or assistant will be knocked about, and whatever they do when he is not there, they can do precisely little when he is there.

19123. The CHAIRMAN.—We have it in evidence that Mr. Welby himself and other inspectors all over the country still examine in the old results style?—Well, I heard he did that in the beginning. He did not examine, so far as I am aware, in the old results style under me. I would be very glad if he would take up a class and examine it.

19124. The BISHOP or DEAN.—That has been brought as a charge against him not merely in one district but in other districts. It has been brought as a charge against inspectors that they examine to examine too much?—That is not my personal experience.

24th July, 1938.]

Mr. PATRICK OWENS, B.A., examined.

[Continued.]

The CHAIRMAN.—That was complained of by two of your colleagues in the Tipperary district.

Mr. COPPEY.—The complaint rather was not as to examination, but as to the fact that they had been working for Mr. Brown in the spirit of the new programme, and that Mr. Welply came without any notice and examined in the old style.

19205. The CHAIRMAN.—That is so, that Mr. Welply leaves the old regime, whereas Mr. Brown adopted the spirit of the new?—I had two visits from Mr. Brown, and I considered he was a courteous gentleman. He did what Mr. Welply never did—he gave a valuable lesson.

19206. He did, himself?—He did, himself, in the school.

19207. The HONOR OF ROSS.—And did he examine?—He did.

19208. The CHAIRMAN.—Did he take a class?—He would take a class for half an hour or 20 minutes.

19209. Mr. KETTEL.—We were told yesterday that in examining in arithmetic an inspector would base his opinion on the percentage of passes. Would Mr. Welply do that?—He would in Mathematics. Now, mathematics is quite out of the school. Mr. McKelrine came to me, and he numbered the boys in fives, and he gave one question to each boy and only one, a written question. I could not make him understand that that was not fair. He considered one question as good as five. Now, anyone in the class might take three out of five questions, and I believe they would, and that they would all pass, but I only get half fees that year.

19210. The CHAIRMAN.—You say in your price that practically there is no inducement given to young teachers to study?—Yes, that is very important.

19211. Does that mean that you would have teachers promoted at under the old system by examination again?—I look on it in this way, that when a young teacher comes out of training after a two-years' course, he is sent to a country school or a village school; he has done his reading, he need never open a book more, except so far as teaching under the new programme. Now, after a two-years' course he thinks he wants a rest, and he takes a rest, and the rest is continued, he has nothing to do, and he goes about and gets acquainted with people, and all that sort of thing, he naturally gravitates downwards.

19212. That is your experience of the system?—Well, that is what I believe happens, and what I have seen happen. Instead of looking up he gravitates downwards.

19213. These young men are suffering from want of intellectual stimulus?—Yes; I say a very young teacher should be encouraged to study, and that by his study he would become a better teacher, because if a man reads, the knowledge that he has acquired will come out in every subject almost. Now, if he gets into the habit of reading he will stick to it, and the country will be very likely benefited by it.

19214. Would you make every stage of promotion depend on it?—I would make it depend on some sort of examination or test. I think it would be advisable not alone in the interests of education, but in the interests of the teachers themselves.

19215. Then, the next point is that the initial salaries are too small, and promotion too slow. We have had an immense amount of evidence on that already?—Yes. I would let the initial salary remain, provided the promotion was not too slow. Of course under the present circumstances if a man was a good boy for 30 years he would get to be first of first.

19216. I suppose you would abolish the present system of merit marks and triennial increments?—Decidedly.

19217. Now may I ask you as a man of great experience, have you in your head a system that you

would put in its place?—Now I would certainly prefer the old system of promotion of teachers.

19218. The HONOR OF ROSS.—What would you do with the salaries—how would you manage them?—I commenced with a salary of £32 a year myself, but of course Father O'Leary gave me a guarantee of £30 or £40 school fees in addition, and before I left Toomevara I had an income of £140 a year; so I would not say the present initial salaries are too small provided that within a reasonable time an intelligent teacher would get promotion.

19219. But would you have any increment of salary apart from promotion?—I would, because I would have good teaching to go along with examination. Of course I would not make the examinations hard (though in my time I thought they were difficult enough), but the difference is that, that I would make it principally with regard to teaching and works on education; I would have the examination more in that line. I would go in for mathematics also.

19220. But I have not got an idea of how you would work out the promotion. Take the teachers that exist scattered over the country?—Yes.

19221. At present their salaries are increased every three years?—Sometimes, not always.

19222. But speaking generally they are?—They are.

19223. And those salaries that are not increased are the exceptions. Now have you in your mind any method by which those salaries would be increased beyond the fact that the teacher would have to leave the third grade and go into the second grade or by which a second grade teacher would have his salary increased in any other way than by going from the second grade to the first grade?—Well now I do not exactly know how that could be done. Of course it cannot be done without a good report of the inspector. That was always the case. I myself had three visits from the head inspector during the first year I went in for promotion, because he did not believe I ought to get leave to go in; that I was too short a time in the service.

19224. I will put it to you in this way. If promotions were very rapid so as to fairly satisfy a teacher who would be going on with his work it would result in our having a great bulk of teachers in the country in the highest grade. Now if that happened the money question would become unmanageable?—I see that.

19225. Then on the other hand if promotion is very slow the result will be that we will keep a very large number of teachers at very low salaries, much lower than those at present for a great many years, and I want to know how you would fit together these two things?—I do not know how with your present money you could do it, for I always have said that we were not getting our fair share of money for educational purposes.

19226. I have seen the argument made often by teachers that Ireland is overtaxed to the extent of two and three-quarter millions, and that the teachers ought to get larger salaries. Do you approve of that argument?—Well, the whole question is whether Ireland is getting her proper share of money for taxation.

19227. She has not got as much as Scotland?—Well then she should get it.

19228. What do you say to this argument?—Scotland contributes in taxation 19½ millions of money; she did so last year. Ireland contributes in taxation 10½ millions of money. Now can you pay the teachers as much money out of 10½ millions as out of 19½ millions?—Well, of course it goes without saying that you cannot for you have not the money.

19229. And what becomes of the argument then that Ireland must get as large a grant as Scotland—how can she get it and how can she deserve it?—The argument about the 2½ millions is founded on the fact that Ireland is a distinct nation, a distinct fiscal entity, and therefore one argument destroys the other. Then the Chairman asked you had you any plan in your head that you would substitute for the present plan. We really want to know how you can help us in this way, that is as to how you could improve

the position of the teacher on your lines of promotion?—I would certainly make promotion depend more or less on examination. I would not make the promotion by any means easy.

19220. I want to know your opinion as to how you would provide for increase of salary in the same grade. Of course you would have appeals at present. How are you to decide those appeals?—I would have them decided by the head inspector. I do not like the senior inspectors at all, I do not like the name at all.

19221. The CHAIRMAN.—Would you go back to the old head inspector?—I would. I would have more of them.

19222. The SHERIFF OF ROSS.—Were there no faults to be found in old times with the inspectors?—There were some faults but not so many, my lord; the faults are universal now.

19223. That is in Clonsilla district?—East, West, North and South? I have met teachers from all parts of Ireland.

19224. But we had it in evidence from several witnesses that inspectors before 1800 were more objectionable than those since 1800?—I do not know that. I would not agree with that at all.

19225. The CHAIRMAN.—I should like to ask you about the head inspectors. Would you get rid of the present circuit system, the arrangements as to circuits?—I would not have so many senior inspectors.

19226. Would you restore the old districts with a district inspector in sole command of a district?—I would.

19227. And also would you restore the old system of head inspectors?—I would.

19228. What function would the head inspectors perform that you value particularly?—Well, they were always ready in case of an appeal.

19229. They settled appeals?—They did, and they settled them on the whole satisfactorily.

19230. With regard to the district inspectors whom I remember very well in my youth in the North, they remained for many years in one district in my part of the country?—Yes.

19231. And became well acquainted with the teachers?—Yes.

19232. And they had sole responsibility for that district?—They had.

19233. And that is the point on which you would prefer the old system to the new?—Well, I would not say it so much on account of an inspector being so long in the district, but, of course, I would not like to have them changed too frequently.

19234. We have had it in evidence that they are changed too frequently now, and that it is desirable that an inspector should be at least five years (I think that was the time) in one district, in order to get thoroughly with it?—I prefer that.

19235. Now, we have heard that it is the teachers' interest in order to get increment to cultivate the inspectors' funds at the expense of sound education?—Yes, decidedly. The first question that goes round is "What is this inspector particular about?"—in other words, "What is his bid?"

19236. Was not that the case always under every system?—No, it could not be so under the results system.

19237. We know in our universities it is exceedingly common to find out what a man's peculiar bids are. You find then that teaching is following inspection and inspection is not following teaching?—I do.

19238. You said you would give us instances of personal want of courtesy?—I have given you one already. I will give you another from another senior inspector, Mr. McElwaine. I call it spying more than anything else. He came into my school one day at 11 o'clock, and he had been there three times before, and he ought to have known pretty well what my character was, and he came up behind me, and his first salutation was, "You have 8 more marked on the roll than are present." He said that

in a coarse loud whisper into my ear, and he did not say good morning or anything else like that, and I said "so." "Count them," said he. I said, "I counted them half an hour ago, and I am sure they are right; I will call the roll if you like." "Well, I will go and count them again," said he, and he did so, and he said, "I find you have 10 more marked present than ought to be." I said, "I will call the roll now."

19239. What happened when you said "Shall I call the roll?"—We had six rooms, and we went round from room to room and I asked the assistants, "Are there any boys out of the class?" We called the roll, and we had one boy more present than ought to be. We spent well over a half an hour in that, and the work of the school was completely upset during that half hour. The boys did not know what was up. I think they thought that there was something terrible wrong.

19240. Go on to the injustice of holding a principal responsible for the work of all the assistants when he has no voice in their appointment?—Yes.

19241. Now, is it the case that the principal is not consulted in the appointment of assistants?—It depends on the manager?—It depends on the manager, at least the manager can and will appoint anyone he wishes, and an assistant might be there before the principal. I am quite certain of opinion that the manager in Rosses would appoint no one without consulting me about it, but it is often the case; and one or two of my assistants might lower the mark, and I dare say my own personal mark. In May, 1910, the school got "good" on an inspection by Mr. Yates; and Mr. Yates stated to me that he could not give me full credit for my own work in the school, that every year my boys took over £100 worth of exhibitions in colleges and under the Technical Department—(I teach under the Technical Department myself).

19242. It is a very thorny question; it affects the rights of managers?—I do not see why in the world it would be just or right to throw the responsibility on the teacher. I say an assistant is a classified teacher, and I say every classified teacher should be held responsible for the work he or she does.

19243. That is your point?—Yes, and I say that the duty of a principal teacher is not superintendence. I never believed in that; I believed in working and showing an example of work.

19244. But surely a senior teacher, being principal ought to have some supervision?—Oh yes; reasonable supervision, of course; but if an assistant does not do his work satisfactorily—if he does not, or if she does not do her work satisfactorily I do not see how the principal should be held responsible for that. Supposing that I were looking for promotion and looking for my increment I would consider it exceedingly hard for me that I should be kept back from promotion because one assistant's work was not up to the mark in the inspector's opinion.

19245. Mr. COOPER.—An assistant in whose appointment you had no voice?—I had no voice whatever.

19246. The CHAIRMAN.—The other point you wish to refer to is the uselessness of appeals by teachers to the Board?—I gave you one example myself, the only appeal practically I ever made, and it was no use. Of course, that never went before the Board.

19247. That was the only one?—Yes, and I think when a teacher of my record had that experience it is no great wonder that others do not appeal.

19248. You refer to your letter to Dr. Sturkie?—Yes.

19249. That is the case in which he said that he could not make any alteration?—Yes, where he said he had looked into the case and was sorry he could not make any alterations in it.

19250. And that censure was about the examination of a master?—Yes, that I had neglected teaching him. Now, as a matter of fact, I have been

26th July, 1913.]

MR. PATRICK OWENS, B.A., examined.

[Continued.]

always hard working (and I am still hard working I am glad to say). I have never neglected a duty, and I can say honestly here before you that I never yet neglected a duty in school; and I never worked harder than I did that year for my monitors. I knew I never worked harder or more earnestly, and of course as I said before I considered it exceedingly hard at the end of my term of years to have that letter sent to me. I felt it very keenly.

19261. The *Business of Ross*.—These monitors are appointed by the inspector?—They are examined by the inspector. Of course it is the manager who makes the appointment.

19262. I do not think so; the manager has no power to appoint the monitor?—He cannot appoint the monitor but he can do this. There are four or five boys examined for three places and no boy can go forward for that examination without the manager's permission.

19263. And the teacher's?—And the teacher's.

19264. But is it not the fact that the inspector might appoint a monitor in opposition to the recommendation of the teacher and the manager?—That has never come under my notice.

19265. Well, I have a case distinctly before my mind—of course what you say is correct, that they would not be examined at all I believe if the manager did not allow them to go forward for examination; but I have a case distinctly before my mind where a manager said "You are going to appoint the wrong person," and the wrong person was appointed. So it is the inspectors who appoint?—Yes.

19266. The *Chairman*.—There remains one thing I wish to ask you about. You say there is universal discontent among the teachers?—In the whole course of my service I never knew of more discontent. I speak of teachers from different parts of the country.

19267. All over?—All over, from different parts of the country, and I know from the *Roscoe Association* and the associations round about that there seems to be unrest among the teachers and discontent; they do not know where they are; and when there is discontent there will never be sound work.

19268. Was there no such discontent under the old results system?—Never. Of course there would be complaints; we will always have complaints; we can have no system under which there wouldn't be complaints, but there is no question in the world about the discontent and about the being general throughout the country and among the very best teachers.

19269. It is very intense in two districts at any rate?—Well, I think it has culminated here; it has come to a point here but my candid belief is that the teachers were in a state of smouldering rebellion and it only wanted something to just give it an opportunity of coming to the front.

19270. Have you any more points that you wish to bring before us?—I do not think so.

19271. Mr. *Hewar*.—You think that the promotion of teachers is entirely too slow?—I do under the present circumstances.

19272. Of course you are aware that under the most favourable circumstances (that is, leaving out special promotion), it takes a teacher 36 years to get to the top?—Yes.

19273. And you would be in favour of some regulation by which teachers would be reduced to study?—Yes; I know if I had not this inducement in the beginning of my career, I would not remain 34 hours in the service.

19274. His Lordship was questioning you as to how you would fit in this system of examining teachers with the system of annual increments. Could not that difficulty be overcome if you had an examination in going from grade to grade and having the increments in the grades themselves?—Decidedly.

19275. And would you be in favour of having those increments annual?—Yes, I would make them annual.

19276. And automatic?—And automatic.

19277. And now to have them automatic, would you not require some provision by which the teacher

would be kept to the faithful discharge of his duty?—Decidedly; I would have an examination by an examiner, whatever you might call him, a Senior or Head Inspector, in addition, irrespective of the ordinary inspection.

19278. That would be necessary for getting from grade to grade, but you would not think it necessary to bring a special inspector in an ordinary case?—Not at all.

19279. I will read the rule which applies to increments under the London County Council, and that is a Body that has 20,000 teachers under its control, and a regulation that would be suitable for it, I suppose, would be fairly suitable for people in this country. Rule 24 is "Annual increments of salary according to scale are allowed for each year of satisfactory service. The annual increment falls due on the first of the month following the anniversary of the teacher's entering into the service." Would you approve of that regulation?—Yes; I think the teachers would have no reason to object to that.

19280. Then it goes on to explain "The phrase 'Year of satisfactory service' means a period of twelve months during which a teacher has not been guilty of any grave misconduct." Would you be satisfied with that definition a year of satisfactory service?—I would; I would not care for anything better than that.

19281. And do you think it would be desirable in order to induce teachers to study and thus improve themselves and improve their capacity for teaching, to have some system of examination by which they would go from grade to grade?—Yes. When the system came out first I remember a head inspector came round to visit my school shortly after the new regulations came into force for the purpose of asking my opinion about the new regulations, and I said one of the things that would tell against the system was that there was no encouragement to study, and I believe that that is a great blot, and a great loss to the teachers, and a great loss to the pupils and schools generally.

19282. I suppose some of the teachers leaving the training colleges have not got as wide a course of reading and study as is desirable?—I do not think so, and a good deal of the knowledge they have acquired in the training colleges will evaporate in a short time; let them out into the country for a couple of years, and a whole lot of it will evaporate.

19283. You think that the education of the country has not improved under the present system?—I have not the slightest doubt of it, and, taking the boys and girls that are leaving schools now, I believe they are by no means as well fitted as they were heretofore to face the world.

19284. Are the people entering the teaching profession as well equipped as they were?—I do not know.

19285. You know the entrance examination to the training colleges is not very difficult?—I know it is very easy.

19286. And I suppose you are aware that a very large number are not able to pass?—I am aware of that.

19287. Are you aware that at present the National Board are considering what they will do to get men candidates?—Well, there is only one way to do it.

19288. I know that in our own college this year we have had a very large proportion of the candidates break down?—I was told by the Principal in Marlborough Street the other evening that they had a similar experience, and as far as my information goes it is more or less general.

19289. We are licensed for 50 men, and, therefore, as we have a two years' course we can take in 25 annually. We have had 22 candidates this year for the 25 places, and 11 of them passed; and when a professor inquired whether they could not revise the examination papers so as to get in more of the candidates, he was informed that the papers were revised before they sent them; and that is the state of things as far as candidates for training are concerned. Now, to what would you attribute

24th July, 1928.]

Mr. PATRICK OWENS, B.A., examined.

[Continued.]

but falling off in competition for entering the teaching profession at the present time?—Well, it might be due to two things—one is dissatisfaction at the salaries, and the other is dissatisfaction at the curriculum.

19290. But, as a matter of fact, we get better candidates and a larger supply of candidates when the commencing salaries were lower than at present?—Yes; but there was a better chance of promotion at the time, and things were cheaper at that time. Money was better at that time than it is now.

19291. And, of course, you admit that we cannot have an efficient system of education in the country if we had not efficient teachers?—Of course; if you do not get the proper material you will never manufacture teachers.

19292. The CHAIRMAN.—What year did you get your first of first?—In the year 1876, four years after I entered. I was a pupil-teacher under training when I was only 18 years of age, and I got first of second, and I would have got a first class if I had any appointment under the Board, but I had no school; I was a free lance.

19293. Mr. HENLY.—You told us that the want of sufficient competition of candidates is due partly to the absence of speedy promotion, and partly to the conditions of the service. Do you think that when the teachers read your evidence, as it will be published, that a man of your unblemished record and after such services as you have given to the country, could be dealt with by the Commissioners in the way that you are dealt with in 1918, it will tend to induce candidates to enter the profession?—No; I have not the least hesitation in saying that the reports throughout the country about the way teachers are handled by inspectors tends to militate against candidates joining the service.

19294. Do you think the system could prosper when the old teachers who have given their best for years and years are to be treated in that way?—Oh no, and I think in any other service in the world there is more leniency shown to seniority than under the National Board.

19295. And there is nothing given for that, only a charge of inefficiency?—The longer you work the more anxious they are to get rid of you.

19296. And the most junior inspector, I suppose will sometimes show little consideration?—Yes; I have been asked by a junior inspector where my notes were for teaching. I would venture to say that I would take the whole staff of inspectors of the Board of Education, and I would teach a class compared with any one of them.

19297. The CHAIRMAN.—How long is that age?—That is only about two years ago.

19298. Mr. HENLY.—What was the work you were engaged in at the time?—He merely wanted to know what my notes were about.

19299. On all subjects?—Oh, of course, on all subjects. Well, I had been teaching all my life. With regard to notes, I must say that I consider it very desirable for young teachers to have notes and long notes for some years, at all events for a considerable number of years, until they get thoroughly up in their work.

19300. Would you be in favour of more examination of the school than we have?—I would. I cannot understand that an Inspector will ever get at the bottom of what the children know, or what they have been taught without examination.

19301. I cannot see how an inspector can tell how a boy can read or not without hearing him read?—No.

19302. Now, if there should be examination of all the pupils, should the teacher get notice of the time that the examination would be held?—Of course, it would be desirable, but still I do not think it would be necessary that he should. If he knows the month that it will be in probably that would be sufficient. Of course, there may be some pupils absent and that is the only difficulty.

19303. But you are talking of town schools. Let us take the case of rural schools where children might be absent for harvest work?—Yes; it will be best to know what the conditions of the pupils are.

19304. If that be so, should each school have its own school year as we had formerly?—Yes; there is a difficulty in getting over that with regard to inspection. You cannot have the examination without having a particular year. You cannot make all the school years of a district end at the same time if you have examination.

19305. Would it be desirable that we should revert to the system that each school should have its own school year?—I cannot see how you can get over the difficulty without doing that.

19306. You have objected, and I think properly objected, to testing pupils in arithmetic or any other subject by one question?—Yes, decidedly; I could not by any means consider it fair.

19307. Do you think it is hardly fair that if a pupil has one question put to him and cannot do that question he should be put down as knowing no arithmetic?—Yes, and the senior inspector that did that I could not make understand that that was not absolutely fair.

19308. And I am sure you would not think it fair to have even a number of questions set on one particular portion of the programme?—No; he gave out five questions on different parts of the programme, one boy getting one and one boy getting another.

19309. And you think that a sufficient number of questions ought to be given?—Yes, decidedly; if you examine, examine, and if you don't, don't.

19310. These questions should range over the whole programme?—Yes, to see what the boys have done and what they have learned.

Mr. P. J. FORBATT, Principal of Gortnagowna School, examined.

19311. The CHAIRMAN.—How long have you been principal of Gortnagowna School, county Tipperary?—I was appointed principal in October, 1909.

19312. That was just at the beginning of the new system?—Yes, just about before it.

19313. Had you principal charge of any school before that?—No, sir.

19314. You were an assistant?—I was an assistant in Deerpark National School, Athlone.

19315.—What number of pupils have you in Gortnagowna?—I have 67 at present on the rolls.

19316. Have the numbers risen lately?—Well, I can give the averages.

19317. Now, what is your present grading?—On the 1st of July last I was promoted to second grade, since I wrote out this evidence.

19318. When you wrote it you were in the third grade?—Yes, sir.

19319. You were in the third grade till last year?—Yes, sir, and I was promoted from the 1st of April, 1912.

19320. The promotion took effect from that date?—Yes.

19321. Now, you have said you were trained in St. Patrick's in 1897-99, and passed with special distinction, which entitled you to first class after two years' efficient service?—Yes.

19322. Then you became assistant in Deerpark National School, Athlone, in October, 1899?—Yes.

19323. And you were appointed principal of your present school in October, 1909?—Yes.

19324. On being appointed principal, your salary was fixed at £57 per annum?—Yes, that was what I earned as assistant in Deerpark National School during the year I was teaching there.

19325.—The average for the three years?—I was only one year there teaching.

19326. You say you were promised special consideration?—Well, teachers in my position at that time, who had passed with special distinction, were

24th July, 1913.]

Mr. P. J. FOGARTY examined.

[Continued.]

promised special consideration, but of course, there was a change made in the rules at that time.

19327. Special consideration with regard to your grade and your salary?—Yes, with regard to my classification.

19328. What did you expect?—Well, the year I was appointed principal in Gortnagowna, I might make about £80 a year. On my class I would have £55 10s., and these results.

19329. So that this was a fall from your previous income?—Yes, it was a fall from what I would earn as principal under the results system.

19330. Of £23?—Yes, about that.

19331. Mr. HENLY.—Passing with special distinction you would be eligible for promotion to second division of first class in three years?—Yes, sir, in two years.

19332. Under the old rules?—Under the old rules.

19333. And you were deprived of that chance of promotion?—Yes.

19334. The CHAIRMAN.—Your salary was increased by £2, and you had two increments of £7 and one of £4, the latter on April 1st, 1906, bringing up your salary to £77?—Yes.

19335. That is the highest salary you could get until promotion to second grade?—Yes, sir.

19336. I will go on to the reports which you have had, beginning with 1905, in that same school?—Well, all the reports were "good."

19337. In October, 1905, you got "good," and the inspector says: "The school maintains a creditable standard of efficiency, and in certain points improvement has been made since last annual inspection. The average attendance would entitle the school to the services of an assistant."?—Yes, the average was raised at that time.

19338. Then in August, 1906, Mr. Yates gave you "good," and he said: "The teacher has taught a large number of pupils successfully with very little assistance. Under the circumstances, I think the proficiency shown was satisfactory."?—Yes, sir.

19339. The same inspector in 1907 gave you "very good"?—Yes, sir.

19340. He says: "I found the work of the school year proceeding in a very satisfactory manner."?—Yes.

19341. And the same inspector in 1908 gave you only "good"?—Yes.

19342. What defects did he notice in his criticism?—It was the reading in the 3rd and 4th standard.

19343. It was that that pulled you down?—I think so, yes.

19344. Then you rose again in 1909 and got "very good" from the same inspector?—Yes.

19345. He says: "The teachers of this school work diligently, and the general condition of the school is creditable. I am glad to learn that cookery will be introduced this year. Some flowers in front form a pleasant contrast to the surroundings." You have continued that ever since?—Yes, sir.

19346. Now we come to Mr. Welpy in 1910?—Yes.

19347. Sir HERAM WILKINSON.—You say that Mr. Yates in 1908 gave you "good"?—On account of the reading in the 3rd and 4th standards. Well, of course, sir, the reason why is not explained here.

19348. Who had charge of the 3rd and 4th standards?—It was I.

19349. What time did you get your promotion to the second grade. It is dated from April 1st, 1912, but what time did you receive the notification?—The 1st of July this year.

19350. Now, let us hear what you have got to say about Mr. Welpy's examination. You say Mr. W. H. Welpy, Senior Inspector, examined in 1910 and lowered your merit mark of "very good" to "fair"?—Yes. I was not satisfied with his method of examination. He did not ask for the progress book to ascertain what portion of the school programme the pupils had been taught although only

five months of the school year had elapsed, including five weeks vacation. He examined in the old results system style, and his manner towards the pupils was hasty. I worked as diligently if not more so, during the year 1910, as in the preceding years owing to my promotion depending on maintaining the good standard I had raised the school to, and, in my opinion, the pupils were as intelligent as painful in attendance and as carefully taught as in the previous year. I felt I had been unjustly treated by Mr. Welpy, and as my manager thought likewise he applied on January 21st, 1911, to have the school re-examined, but his request was refused by the Commissioners. This is Mr. Welpy's report:—"The condition of this school is disappointing. Geography, needlework and drill have been pretty well taught, but in all other subjects the instruction fails in thoroughness. Oral composition and arithmetic were very backward. At object lessons the pupils make no adequate response. Written composition and spelling have been very indifferently taught in 3rd and 4th standards, and much more could be done in singing, grammar and junior drawing. The organisation, too, could be improved as suggested. There is no doubt that the teachers are capable of doing better work, and I trust that they will do so. There is no globe and no scale map." I worked as diligently if not more so during that year as in the preceding years. Mr. Yates examined the school in the following year and raised the merit mark to "good."

19352. Mr. KITTLE.—The report was received in January, 1911?—Yes.

19353. And the date of the appeal is the 21st of January?—Yes, and here in the reply I got from the Commissioners. The manager applied for re-examination, and the Commissioners said:—"Rev. Sir.—With reference to your letter of 21st ultimo, I am directed to inform you that the Commissioners are unable to order a re-examination of the school, as they see no reason for supposing that the inspector's report has not fairly represented what the state of the school was as he found it at the last general inspection."

19354. What is the date of that letter?—23rd of February.

19355. That is just a month after?—Yes.

19356. Sir HERAM WILKINSON.—Then the application was refused?—Yes, sir.

19357. Now, look at page 203 in the Appendix to our First Report, at letter B. It is your school that is referred to there: "This school was marked 'very good' in 1907, 'good' in 1908, and 'very good' in 1909. Mr. Welpy in 1910 reduces the mark to 'fair.' Teacher feeling aggrieved applies to office to have school re-examined. He is refused. This is practice in the alleged right of appeal." It is your school that is there referred to?—Yes.

19358. Look over to page 201. Under B three Mr. Welpy says:—"This is Gortnagowna National School. The teacher did not apply for an immediate re-examination. He asked for an examination towards the end of the school year, and he made no protest at all against or impudently at all of the examination that had been held so far as I can recollect. The fact was that he had not been working. I admit he is capable of doing much better work and I told the Board so in my reply to his appeal." That was the first you knew of what was Mr. Welpy's reply to the Board?—Yes.

19359. Now, will you turn over to page 207. You there say: "Mr. Welpy visited the above school on September 13, 1910; November 7, 1910, and December 1st, 1910, and he examined on December 1st, 1910. Although only one-third of the programme for the year was done at the time, he examined on the full year's programme, and his examination was mostly on the results' style. He did not ask for the progress book. During parts of his examination his manner towards the children was hasty. The reports for the previous three years were 'very good,' 'good,' and 'very good' respectively; and at this examination the report was lowered to 'fair' thus depriving the teacher of promotion, and a re-examination was asked for, but was refused."

19360. On page 212, at the bottom of the second column, Mr. Welpy says: "I have dealt with this school in my previous report as well as in my report on the application for a re-examination. These reports should be seen. My recollection is that the re-examination was asked for towards the end of the school year. In the present communication Mr. Fogarty advances three new statements. (My recollection is that they are new)—(1) the examination was on the full year's programme; (2) during part of the examination my manner was hasty towards the children; (3) I did not ask for the progress book. Why did not Mr. Fogarty make these statements before instead of concealing them for 10 months? I dealt with this case when all the details were fairly fresh in my mind, and I am certain that if these complaints had been formulated then I should have urged the Board to order a fresh inspection at once. Of one thing I am perfectly sure—the tests where given, were not on a year's work, but only on the work that had been done. This teacher marked for me himself most of the written tests, and I have these somewhere. He knows perfectly well the quality of the pupils' answering, but the fact is he had just been marking time up to the date of my inspection at which he made no objection at all to any test given." Now, what observation have you to make about this statement of Mr. Welpy?—Mr. Welpy did not ask for my progress book. His manner was very hasty during the examination. In fact when I was calling the rolls he asked me to call them quickly. During the greater part of the work he urged the children to do their work quickly, and I would say that it would be on this account that the work may not appear so creditable or so well done.

19361. That the children did not answer as well as they might otherwise?—Yes, in the written work especially; they were urged on very quickly.

19361A. There are some other points here. Why do you say that he marked on the whole year's programme?—Take grammar for example; he examined the 3rd standard on sentences containing the subject predicate object and extension of the predicate. That, I may say, is the full year's programme. Of course, they would want to know the parts of speech.

19362. But you consider that the question that he put were not such as they ought to be expected to have mastered at the stage at which he examined them?—Yes, sir.

19363. Now, what have you to say to his statement that you had just been marking time?—I cannot answer that, because I worked as diligently that year as ever I worked, and even more so on account of my promotion depending on that year.

19364. From the beginning of the school year up to that time you had been working as well as you would naturally at any time of the year?—Yes.

19365. Mr. HENLY.—Have you not given the answer that it was not true that you were only marking time?—Yes.

19366. Sir HERAM WILKINSON.—Now, would you give the observations made by Mr. Welpy in the observation book at that time—have you the observation book here?—No, sir.

19367. Mr. HENLY.—Have you an extract from it?—Yes.

19368. Sir HERAM WILKINSON.—Then will you give it?—He visited on the 13th September, 1910, from 1.5 to 2.25. That was his first incidental visit. There were 51 present. He says: "The closet requires to be cleaned out. The supporting joints of floor are decayed in places. . . . Do not mix up the exercises."

19369. Do you know what was the meaning of that?—Yes, sir.

19370. What was that?—In the copy-books he wanted to keep the compositions together in one portion, the arithmetic in another portion, and the grammar in another portion.

19371. Not to take them chronologically?—Yes, sir.

19372. That was his second suggestion; now, what was the third?—"Encourage taste and ex-

pression in reading. Pay more attention to grammar and analysis. 4th.—I do not make any noting on the organization at present. At a longer visit I mean to look into this matter. 5th.—Suggest improved methods of preparation." That means that he suggested improved methods of preparation to me, for daily work.

19373. Had you made preparation?—Yes.

19374. And showed him your preparation?—Yes.

19375. And he thought that it might be improved?—Yes; he pointed out a better plan for instance of preparing a lesson.

19376. He pointed out a better plan?—Yes.

19377. Did he find any fault?—Yes, sir.

19378. And when he came on his next visit had you been acting on his suggestion?—Yes, sir.

19379. Mr. HENLY.—Did you read all that he wrote?—Yes, that is all.

19380. The HANCOCK OF ROSS.—What was the date of that visit?—The 13th of September, 1910.

19381. Was that a complete inspection of the school?—It was only an incidental visit.

19382. He seems to have gone fairly through all the work?—Yes.

19383. Mr. COFFEY.—Was he in the school from 1.5 to 2.25?—Yes.

19384. Sir HERAM WILKINSON.—What was the next visit?—The next was November 7th, 1910.—Visited from 2.45 to 3.20. I am very pleased to see the repairs that have been executed here since my last visit. Pupils here do not speak loud enough when reading. . . . This is the only objection I have to that. My school is a two-teacher school and we have only one room. Mr. Welpy suggested that at the reading lesson "the pupils stand at one end of the room, and the teacher at the other," and if this were done the assistant could not work properly.

19385. If you did that the assistant could not work?—No, sir.

19386. So that you were compelled in the matter of the suggestion of longer reading to consider the fact that the room was occupied by another assistant and another class who could not work?—Yes, sir; and the next is the general inspection.

19387. And what does he write in the observation book?—"Inspection 9.25 to 9.30. 57 present. Organisation might be changed with advantage. This morning from 10 to 10.30 junior pupils did nothing in the desks, both teachers being engaged at geography on the floor. There should be four groups, and each teacher should have two and one of these should be on the floor while the other is in the desks at a general rate. Oral composition is very weak, and pupils do not speak clearly, confidently, and in sentences when necessary. . . . They have little power to read an unseen passage. Drawing is of poor quality in the junior standards. The infants draw on slates. . . . Grammar is backward in 2nd and 4th standards. Arithmetic should be more effectively taught in the 2nd standard and in the 4th standard. . . ."

19388. What observation have you to make upon this?—Well, Mr. Welpy when he was leaving the school that evening asked me to read his observations, and I read them, and he asked me was I satisfied. Of course, I could not see from that what mark I would get, whether it would be "fair" or "excellent." There was nothing to show that it was going to be reduced from "very good" to "fair." Of course, as he was the Senior Inspector and his manner was I must say, rude, I felt that it was better not to say anything at all.

19389. And you made no observation at the time?—No, sir, till I got the report after.

19390. Mr. COFFEY.—In other words you were afraid to speak?—I was, sir. I did not like as he was the Senior Inspector. I never like to cross any inspector in his remarks.

19391. Mr. HENLY.—You think it more prudent not to?—Well, I think so.

19382. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Can you tell me how it was that you got your promotion finally—did you get it dated back to the earliest time that you could obtain it?—I saw my manager (the Rev. J. Cunningham) about the matter, and he wrote to the Commissioners drawing their attention to my work and to my promotion. He got a communication from the Commissioners stating that my case was considered and that it was postponed till the next general report. Well, that general report took place in last May, the 12th of May last.

19393. In this year?—In this year, and then from that report I got my promotion, dated back.

19394. The CHAIRMAN.—Was that Mr. Fitzgerald?—No, sir, that was Mr. Mahon; he is on our current list for the last couple of years.

19395. What mark did he give you?—"Good." Mr. Yates raised Mr. Welgely's mark to "good," and then Mr. Mahon gave "good" also, and said the school is making good progress.

19396. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Then the 1900 inspection was by Mr. Yates. That was before Mr. Welgely's?—Yes, and the next examination was by Mr. Welgely, and he reduced it.

19397. After Mr. Welgely's report when were you next examined?—I think in November of the following year.

19398. By whom?—Mr. Yates.

19399. And what mark did he give you?—"Good."

19400. And then you were examined in May last?—Yes.

19401. By Mr. Mahon?—Yes.

19402. And he gave you a "good"?—Yes.

19403. You were notified on the 1st of July that you had been promoted from the 1st of April, 1913?—Yes.

19404. So that financially you have not suffered by the lowering of your mark?—No, except the delay of course; it caused a little worry.

19405. When you went to the school what sort of a school was it?—It was in a very bad state.

19406. And you give the report of an annual inspection held prior to your appointment?—Yes, this is the report of the annual examination which took place in August, 1900, and I was appointed in the October following:—"Only 24 pupils attended for examination, less than half the usual number at this school. Of these none were higher than third class. The defects of the teaching displayed by the examination are sufficient to account for this falling off. The children of 1st and 2nd class wrote fairly well, but in the other subjects (except needlework) I could find no evidence of either care or skill on the part of the teacher. Notwithstanding the small number present there was a complete absence of discipline and order. Three-fourths of the panes of glass in the school windows have been broken for some months."

19407. That was in 1900?—Yes; the average for that year was 22.5.

19408. Mr. KERR.—Mr. Welgely reduced you two steps from "very good" to "fair"?—Yes.

19409. Mr. COFFEY.—Are you aware that there has been very great discontent in the Clonmel Circuit with the marking of Mr. Welgely?—Yes, sir.

19410. Are there any grounds for the statement that Mr. Welgely made in the memorandum he submitted to the Board that the teacher of Gortagowna did not appeal for immediate re-examination—did not your manager do that?—Yes, I have the reply here. He received it on the 18th January, and he appealed on the 21st.

19411. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Have you a copy of your manager's letter to the Board?—No. I think when I got the report, my manager wrote to Mr. Welgely saying that he was surprised at the report and asking him to say whether he would consider the matter or hold a re-examination. He knew that there must be something wrong when the mark was reduced by two steps, and Mr. Welgely wrote back to say that he could not, and then my manager wrote to the Board for re-examination, and this was the reply as I have already shown.

19412. What is the date of the reply?—The 23rd of February.

19413. The CHAIRMAN.—Did you ask for an immediate examination?—I cannot say what my manager, Canon McCormack asked for, as he was old and perhaps forgetful, but I asked him to write asking for re-examination.

19414. The point is that Mr. Welgely says you asked for that re-examination at the end of the school year?—I don't know about that. Mr. Statfield and Mr. Hynes visited a school within three miles of mine.

19415. They did not come to you at all?—No, sir.

19416. The BISHOP OF ROSA.—There seems to me some difficulty about the dates here. You say you appealed on the 21st of January after a letter had come down to you from the Board?—Yes.

19417. What was the date?—The 19th of January.

19418.—I think I gather from you that the manager wrote then first to Mr. Welgely?—Yes, on that date.

19419. And secondly, when he got Mr. Welgely's reply he wrote to the Board?—Yes.

19420. If you look at the dates this will hardly hold together?—Oh yes, my lord.

19421. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Just read the opening words of the letter acknowledging the receipt of the letter from the manager?—"With reference to your letter of the 23rd ultimo."

19422. And the date of that is?—23rd of February.

19423. The BISHOP OF ROSA.—That is from the Board?—Yes, my lord.

19424. I think your pencil is hardly quite accurate, because if this report on the school came down to you on the 19th of January, and then your manager wrote to Mr. Welgely, and then he got a reply from Mr. Welgely, and he wrote then to the National Board, he could have hardly done all that between the 19th and the 21st of January?—It would be possible, I think, my lord.

19425. Mr. KERR.—Mr. Welgely lives in Clonmel, does he not?—Yes.

19426. Mr. COFFEY.—You are quite clear, are you, Mr. Fogarty, that Mr. Welgely did not ask for the progress record?—Yes, sir.

19427. That is at his examination of the school on the 1st of December, 1910?—Yes, sir.

19428. One-third of the school year had only passed over at that time?—Well, there were five weeks' vacation.

19429. Well, a third roughly?—Yes, roughly.

19430. And are you quite clear that as you stated Mr. Welgely examined on the whole programme of the year?—On some subjects.

19431. What written exercises did you correct for Mr. Welgely, as he says in one of his memoranda that: "The teacher marked for me"?—I corrected dictation for 3rd and 4th standards, and I think also composition for the same standards and arithmetic for 5th and higher standards.

19432. He makes a very serious charge or complaint against you that you had been simply marking time up to that date?—I never did, for I always worked very diligently.

19433. You say that that statement has no foundation?—No foundation whatever.

19434. And that you were working your school in the usual diligent way?—Yes, sir.

19435. Mr. HENRY.—Whereabouts is Gortagowna?—It is in the parish of Templederry, Co. Tipperary.

19436. What schools have you in the vicinity or within three miles of you?—Gawnakilla, Templederry, Curmenny, and Kilmeeave.

19437. Are all these within three miles of you?—The last is more than three.

19438. What was the average of the school when you took charge of it?—22.5.

19439. And what is your average attendance at present?—Last year it was 43.3; there was some little dropping off.

19440. But at any rate during your time you more than doubled the average attendance?—Yes, sir.

24th July, 1913.]

Mr. P. J. FOGARTY examined.

[Continued.]

19441. Where did that increase of attendance come from?—Well, at the time I took charge the children were going to the surrounding schools, and it took some time to bring them back.

19442. And you succeeded in getting the children of that circuit back again to your own school?—Yes, sir.

19443. And I think that is a factor of the situation and it shows that you must have been given a fair amount of satisfaction to the parents in that district?—Yes.

19444. Your reports were on the whole very satisfactory till Mr. Welphly came?—Yes.

19445. You did not fall away in the efforts that you made when you heard of him arriving in the district?—Oh, no.

19446. And when you were dissatisfied you appealed?—Yes.

19447. And that appeal was refused?—Yes.

Mr. EDMOND GURRY, Principal of Rathgormack National School, examined.

19453. The CHAIRMAN.—How long have you been principal of Rathgormack National School?—Since 1892.

19454. Was that your first appointment as principal?—No, sir; I had been for a few years in Carrick-hag National School, seven or eight miles away.

19455. And had you any school before that?—No, sir; I had been assistant for some years.

19456. In what year did you enter the service of the Board?—In 1887.

19457. And you were appointed to your present school in 1892?—Yes.

19458. You have been there 20 years?—Yes, sir.

19459. How many pupils have you at present?—Seventy-six on the roll at present.

19460. What is your grading?—First of first.

19461. How long have you been that?—I got first division of first class by examination in 1892, the year I was appointed principal in Rathgormack School.

19462. Under the old system?—Yes.

19463. And when you passed under the new system what was your grading?—The same, sir.

19464. And your salary remained the same?—Yes, sir; I got one increment.

19465. You have a record of your reports?—Yes, sir; I have them here.

19466. You begin with June, 1904, when you got "very good" from Mr. Brown. In October, 1905, you got "very good" from the same inspector; in October, 1906, "very good" from Mr. McElroy; in 1907, "very good" from the same; in 1908, "very good" from the same; in 1909, "very good" from the same. In 1910 you dropped from "very good" to "good," which was given you by Mr. Fitzpatrick?—Yes.

19467. And then in November, 1910, you were visited by Mr. Welphly who reduced you to "fair"?—Yes, sir.

19468. And then in October you got "good" from Mr. FitzGerald?—Yes, sir.

19469. That is the record so far?—Yes, and then there is a later one.

19470. Have you any since that?—Yes.

19471. What was that?—"Good" from Mr. Mahon.

19472. That was in 1912?—1913, April.

19473. Can you give us the report by Mr. Fitzpatrick when he gave you your first reduction in February, 1910—you say the relations with inspectors were satisfactory enough until Mr. Fitzpatrick's visit in 1910, and that he after a superficial inspection reduced the school mark from "very good" to "good"?—Yes.

19448. And did Dr. Starke when he visited that district as a matter of fact visit your school?—No, sir.

19449. Although it was one that had come before him asking for an appeal?—Yes, sir.

19450. Did he include it in the list of schools which he submitted to Mr. Hynes for re-inspection?—I think so, sir.

19451. Here are the schools:—Kilteely Boys', Kilteely Girls', Cullen Boys', Monard Boys', Nowa, Carrig Girls', Mandyke, Mulmahone Girls', Moheer, Shevradagh Girls', Loughmore Boys', Roscrea Boys', and Cleah?—Is mine not there?

19452. No. So that though you were one that was specially asking for an appeal, and though he went down to inquire into the state of that district and picked out himself these thirteen schools which he gave to Mr. Hynes, he did not include yours also in the number?—He did not.

19474. And that he said the children were not doing a proportionate share of the work?—Yes, sir.

19475. Will you give us that report in full?—"This present inadequate schoolhouse will soon be closed and the pupils transferred into a new school. The members of the staff work well, but the boys do not make corresponding efforts. They should be taught to take a much larger share in all the oral lessons. Written work is good." That is the whole of it.

19476. Was that schoolhouse in a very bad condition when he visited it?—It was, sir.

19477. Is there only one room?—That is all, sir.

19478. It was not overcrowded?—No; but the roof bad and the windows bad.

19479. Had you to incur any expense yourself in the upkeep?—No, sir.

19480. And I suppose you and your assistant teaching in one room disturbed one another?—We did, sir, to some extent.

19481. Mr. COFFEY.—Had you any conversation with Mr. Fitzpatrick about that, because the terms of the report would seem to indicate a higher mark?—No, sir.

19482. Mr. HENLY.—In connection with that when did Mr. Welphly come into the circuit?—In July, 1910.

19483. Mr. KITTLE.—Is Mr. Fitzpatrick a junior inspector?—A district inspector.

19484. Mr. COFFEY.—When Mr. Fitzpatrick gave that mark to your school, was Mr. Welphly his senior inspector?—He was, sir.

19485. So Mr. Welphly was the senior inspector at the time Mr. Fitzpatrick assigned "good" to your school?—Yes.

19486. Mr. KITTLE.—On the 16th of November, 1910, you got "fair," and the report is:—"I have not often been more disappointed in the condition of a school than I have been in this. The pupils are unkind in appearance, not at all smart, listless, talkative, and much addicted to prompting more especially in the senior standards taught by the principal. Grammar, geography, history and singing have been very inadequately taught; the children have gained very little power to read easy unseen passages and drill as taught produces little effect on the department of the pupils. There is an evident lack of thoroughness in the instruction; the teachers are too easily satisfied and they do not take pains to drive home what they teach. They are capable of producing better results, and I trust they will rouse themselves to do so more especially when their work is carried on under the best possible conditions."—That is Mr. Welphly's report.

19487. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, we go on to the points where you find fault with Mr. Welby's inspection. The first is that he followed the old 'separate' system of individual examination?—Yes, sir.

19488. Will you explain that a little more—you mean that he conducted the examination just as it was done before 1900?—Yes, sir.

19489. Did you see him mark individual children?—Well, I could not tell what he marked in his notebook, but he examined every child.

19490. In every subject?—In every subject.

19491. And how long did he take to do that?—Something over four hours.

19492. Did he take all the standards?—Yes, sir.

19493. Mr. HARRISON.—Did he take the papers away with him?—Yes; he took some of the written work.

19494. The CHAIRMAN.—Then you say what is rather startling, that he seemed to devote special attention to dull and irregular pupils, but in his reply he denies it, and adds how could he have known that these pupils were dull pupils by looking at them?—No, sir, by no means, but he found them by examining them.

19495. He devoted special attention to the dull ones after he found out that they were dull?—It was after he found out that they were dull.

19496. And then he examined them with particular care?—That is my point.

19497. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—There might be two distinct views with regard to that. One would be that having found by an answer or two that a child was dull he then continued to examine that child for the purpose of showing off his stupidity. That is one view?—Yes.

19498. The other view is that he might keep at that child longer to see if he could draw anything out of the child?—Quite so.

19499. You take the view that he examined the child particularly for the purposes of showing up its ignorance?—That is my view.

19500. The CHAIRMAN.—You say you charge him with worrying the children?—Yes, practically.

19501. And from that it would follow that this examination of the dull children was intended to worry them. Is that what was meant as his lordship implies?

The BISHOP OF ROSS.—To show their ignorance?—Yes, that is my belief.

19502. The CHAIRMAN.—I pass over the passing, but you say: "He seemed to expect a year's work done in four months." What were the four months?—July, August, September, and October, and five weeks' holidays.

19503. Did he ask for your progress book?—No, sir.

19504. He did not ask how much work was gone over?—Yes, sir, in three subjects.

19505. And did he exceed the amount that you told him?—No, sir, not in these subjects.

19506. What did you mean by saying that he expected a year's work done in four months?—If I take reading for example, Mr. Welby tested every boy in reading from an ordinary reader. When that was finished he questioned on the subject matter read. The next subject was recitation. He sent each boy to the end of the room, and asked him to recite something. When the boy had recited a piece he was called out to the table and questioned on what he had recited, and the meaning of the passage. The next test of reading was that Mr. Welby took a reader from his bag, and asked each child to read a certain passage which he indicated with his pencil.

19507. I hardly see the bearing of that on the question that I asked you which was as to what was meant by saying that he seemed to expect a year's work done in four months?—I mean that the examination in reading was just as severe as would be expected after twelve months.

19508. But in any other subject did he show the same tendency?—In grammar it was the same.

Those sentences that I have marked there would be all right at the end of the year, or very near the end of the year. If the programme is looked at, in the 2nd and 4th standards the programme is very easy analysis, and there is a great difference between that and the analysing of the sentences which I have instanced there. Then coming to composition, another very important subject he would not have, or any inspector I think would not have asked the children to do more composition at the end of the whole year than what Mr. Welby did at that time. He gave the 6th standard an essay to write which in a two-teacher school is not supposed to be given at all, and asked the 5th standard to write a letter to one of the clergymen in the parish on the points of a cow which one of their labourers had for sale. Standards 3 and 4 were asked to write a description of the school globe. The letter was to be written to a clergyman describing this cow.

The BISHOP OF ROSS.—Was he a member of the County Committee of Agriculture?

19510. The CHAIRMAN.—I see your point is that the proficiency of your pupils at the end of four months was not equal to the examination they had to submit to although they might have done it at the end of the year?—Yes, sir.

19511. And then you go on to say that the children were worried and hurried during the day?—Yes, sir.

19512. Do you mean that he was always asking to have things done hastily?—Yes, to "hurry on," and "were they finished yet?"; and in the composition that I have been speaking about on the school globe, I noticed on more than one occasion that if a little boy was looking at the school globe and his head up, he asked me "why isn't that boy writing?", and "he is idling"; and yet the boy was trying to do his best to collect his ideas, and he was looking at the globe in order to try and collect his little wits.

19513. And then you say there was an epidemic of mumps which kept away some of the most intelligent children?—Yes, sir.

19514. And the inspector thought that that was only mentioned to him as an excuse for the bad results of the examination?—I thought so, sir.

19515. And do you complain that the inspector's manner was actually rude to you?—No; I would not say that he was actually rude.

19516. But unsympathetic?—Unsympathetic but polite, subtly polite, like a man that the less you have to say to him the better he would like it, and the further away you kept from him the better for all parties.

19517. And did you want to have conversation with him?—Yes, I wished to speak about these dull children, but Mr. Welby's manner did not encourage any sort of familiarity whatever.

19518. You did not consult him about anything?—No, sir.

19519. Have you been in the habit of talking with a senior inspection over an inspection?—Yes, very often, nearly always.

19520. And did you find you got help from them generally?—From Mr. Welby's predecessors.

19521. In your experience you have got help?—I have.

19522. I mean in your experience of the inspectors since 1900 (I do not speak of the old system)?—Yes.

19523. I see that in this document you give some of your reports before Mr. Welby's arrival from various inspections including Mr. Brown, Mr. McNary, and so on. Did you confer with those inspectors about your school work?—I did not consult with them; they consulted with me.

19524. They conferred with you?—Yes.

19525. And advised you?—Yes; they would hear what I would have to say on various matters.

19526. I suppose you would wish those reports to be put in?—If you please, sir.

26th July, 1913.]

Mr. EDMOND GURRY examined.

[Continued.]

19327. These date from 1903 when Mr. Brown says: "This school is carefully taught, and the discipline is good. The same inspector in 1904, says: "The school is intelligently taught, and the discipline and training are very good." In 1905, Mr. Brown again says: "This year's work has been satisfactory. The pupils are intelligently taught and well trained." Then Mr. McEnery in 1906: "Satisfactory progress is exhibited in most branches of instruction, and the training of the pupils is very methodically and skilfully conducted. The written work is of very good quality, and shows that careful attention is given to the subject." Again Mr. McEnery in 1907, says: "The instruction generally is on an intelligent line, and in most subjects the high standard of proficiency is exhibited. The pupils are interested in their school work, and are under very good discipline." In 1908, Mr. McEnery says: "This school is conducted with zeal and intelligence, and with very little exception the proficiency of the pupils is very good." Then the same inspector's report in 1909, just before your unfavourable report of 1910, says: "The teaching is generally on intelligent lines, and very good progress is exhibited in most branches of school work." Then Mr. Fitzpatrick in 1910, says: "The members of the staff worked well." Have you anything else you wish to put before us?—No, sir, except the disheartening effect that these reports had on me and on my teaching. Here was I doing my best for 20 years, working away as best I could, and the inspector comes along and, as I maintain, without any justification reduces my report. Then I asked myself was I really going to the bad; could it be possible that I was deteriorating, and I thought how it would look in my manager's eyes, and I thought it was very hard?

19327a. Do you mean that these reports injured you with your manager?—Yes, sir, and then again the children in school—they can easily tell by an inspector whether things are going on alright. They could tell by Mr. Welply at all events.

19328. Did Dr. Starke visit your school in October?—No, sir. You heard of his coming round there?—I heard of his being in the district.

19329. Did Mr. Hynes visit your school?—No, sir.

19330. Sir HIRAM WILKINSON.—You did not sign the Memorial, I think?—No, sir.

19331. But is your school one of the schools mentioned by letter in the Memorial?—I think it is, sir.

19332. Look at that list on page 203?—Letter A is like my school.

19333. And then on page 213, Mr. Welply, in his reply, says: "I did not examine on a year's work, but only on what the pupils had done." Now, your impression is still that his examination was as severe as if he had been examining on a year's programme?—Yes, I still think so, sir.

19334. Mr. COSSET.—I think you said only in some subjects?—Yes, I excepted three.

19335. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—Did he examine in the reading lesson?—No, my lord, not in the ordinary Reader.

19336. But in a special Reader, and the unseen passages which he gave them, you consider were as difficult as they should be at the end of a year?—Yes.

19337. The lesson books were all right from your point of view, but the unseen reading was wrong?—Yes.

19338. The CHAIRMAN.—The boys had not training enough to answer?—Yes.

19339. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—Were the children of 3rd and 4th standards supposed to do some analysis all through the year?—Yes, my lord, they were.

19340. They were supposed to do some analysis all through the year?—Yes.

19341. And your point is that the sentence they got was more difficult than should have been given at that earlier period?—Yes.

19342. Sir HIRAM WILKINSON.—Mr. Welply says: "I did not confine my questions to the dull and irregular pupils, because I did not know them, and I did not judge the work of the school by their answering." You think he did devote a longer time to the dull pupils, and his lordship has pointed out two sentences that might be drawn from that, so I need not go further into that matter. But Mr. Welply says: "The sentences Mr. Gurry gives were set to 5th and 6th pupils. The pupils of the 5th standard were now in their 3rd, and those of the 6th standard in their 4th year in analysis, and the simple sentences quoted are perfectly fair tests in these circumstances." Do you consider them a perfectly fair test?—They would be at the end of the year but not at that early period.

19343. "After two years' teaching a pupil ought to be able to analyse something more than 'John struck the table.' As a matter of fact my notion in my book is that the subject had not been taught at all." Now, what have you to say to that?—Yes, certainly, the subject was taught but not in the way Mr. Welply wanted.

19344. You think he devoted too much attention to antiquated parsing?—To antiquated parsing.

19345. And not in accordance with the "Notes for Teachers"?—No, sir.

19346. "The pupils were neither bristled nor hurried. I gave over four hours to the inspection of 58 pupils here." What have you to say to that?—He insisted on hurrying and hustling the children in 4th standard. They were working questions in arithmetic written on the blackboard by me, and the children were at their work in the desks. When Mr. Welply thought that the children had had time enough to work them, he asked them had they finished. Some of the children were finished, but I think there were three or four boys that had not finished, and he then told those boys to finish their work, and then go on with their composition and he gave out subjects in composition, and three or four boys at least tried to do the two subjects of arithmetic and composition at one and the same time.

19347. He did not give them all sufficient time to finish their arithmetic?—No, sir.

19348. Now, the majority of the pupils he said were untidy?—No, they were not, sir. I will give you an instance of what Mr. Welply put forward in that observation book there. He came into the school on the 3rd of November, I think in the evening, at 3.5, and the first boy that the inspector noticed was standing inside the door, and was a casual, that is a boy I had only once in a while. The parents are very poor, and he was not what you would call a very tidy child. His hair was loose which, as a matter of fact, in the tidest boys you will often find at that hour of the evening. Mr. Welply when he came to the door, said: "Boy, have you brushed your hair?" but this boy I do not suppose ever saw a hair brush in his life; and the inspector went to the observation book, and he puts down: "Pay attention to personal neatness of pupils," implying that a whole lot of the boys were untidy, and I think he was the only one boy.

19349. "I do not know how my manner showed I disbelieved the statement of the teacher." Can you say how it was that you got that impression?—Mr. Welply's manner during the day did not irritate any confidence from the teacher; but in the evening when he was going away, I thought it better to make an attempt at all events, and Mr. Welply was getting ready to depart, and tying up his bag on his bicycle in the porch. I approached Mr. Welply, and I said that I was afraid that he was not very well pleased with the answering of the children during the day, and he replied that he was not. "Well," I said, "it is unfortunate, the day you came; we have an epidemic of mumps just at present among the boys, and it is rather a coincidence that some of the brightest boys are away, and we have had dull ones to-day." During all this time, while I was speaking, Mr. Welply never took very much notice, and did not stop the operation of tying up his bag, and made

no audible reply. As Mr. Welby paid so very little attention to what I was telling him and went on, without saying a word, tying up his bag, I concluded, of course, that he did not want to be bothered at all, and that the least I would say to him the better, and that he thought I was simply making excuses for the children's poor display.

19550. He says: "My manner was not suspicious of the teachers, but I had to be very careful, indeed, about the pupils who persisted in prompting and copying. The tone of this school was distinctly inferior." Now, how is it that they were prompting and copying?—No, I do not think they were, sir, because I always insist in my examinations on perfect honesty, but it would happen and it did happen that some boys having their exercises finished would sit up and glance round at their neighbours, and I did hear one boy whisper to another, "Are you finished?" That was one instance. Mr. Welby thought at once that that was either prompting or copying, or something of that kind.

19551. He says: "The tone of this school was distinctly inferior." Do you admit that?—No, sir; I think that the reports of the previous Inspector will answer that.

19552. You think that the report of the previous inspectors about that the tone of your school was not distinctly inferior?—So I maintain.

19553. And you are quite satisfied to rest your answer on these reports?—Quite satisfied.

19554. And those reports extend from 1902 up to 1909?—Yes, and good reports go even further back.

19555. Mr. Welby says: "I visited again on 12/2/11, and during the drawing lesson, 12 to 12.30, I found several boys eating their lunch, and I found the progress record which I am not supposed according to the Teachers' Memorial, to consult, two months in arrears."—That is the first I heard of it, sir.

19556. You did not see that yourself?—No, sir. Perhaps I might explain that. I was not satisfied with the report and with having the boys put down as naughty, and I said to Mr. Welby: "Well, would you think, sir," said I, "that the boys are untidy to-day?" because to my mind they were just as tidy the first day (that is the reason I mention it), and perhaps they had been better on the first day than they were on the second day; and he in a sort of greasing way, said: "Well, they are fair enough, to-day." And then he wrote that in the observation book which I did not see until he had gone, and if I had I would have drawn his attention to it.

19557. He says that the progress record was two months in arrears. Have you any remark to make?—No, sir, except that since Mr. Welby paid such very little attention to it that I did not consider it of such importance to write it up at all.

19558. Then he says: "Mr. Guiry is a man of intelligence (you won't object to that) who can do much better work if he applies himself."—You see the sting is in the end of it.

19559. You say that you did apply yourself?—Yes, I did.

19560. I wanted to have it quite clear whether peculiarly you have been at a loss in consequence of that mark?—No, sir.

19561. Mr. COFFEY.—But a man of your standing, apart from any pecuniary loss, feels the loss of reputation through the lowering of the mark of the school, as being a serious matter?—Yes.

19562. SIR HULAN WILKINSON.—And if you were to go to another school the fact of that mark would be against you in obtaining a new school?—Quite right, sir.

19563. Mr. HENLY.—Mr. Welby came into this circuit in 1909, did he not?

19564. And then Mr. Fitzpatrick that lowered your mark for the first time from "very good" to "good" was only employed there temporarily as one of the Circuit Inspectors?—I think he was only there for some few months.

19565. From your knowledge of the circuit has Mr. Welby a severe style of marking, and do you know if he has in any way influenced the Junior Inspectors under him?—Well, from my own experience I could not say that.

19566. Have you heard anything to that effect?—Well, I have.

19567. Now at Question 624 of the first volume, Mr. Dilworth was asked: "Supposing a Senior Inspector is stricter than the average of Senior Inspectors, does he influence the Junior Inspectors under him?" and Mr. Dilworth's answer is: "I should say most decidedly," and I think the evidence that we have goes to show that both Mr. Yates and Mr. McNery marked more strictly after Mr. Welby came into that circuit than before?—That is the impression amongst all the teachers.

19568. In the first report he says the pupils are untidy, and you say that was based on one boy?—Yes, so far as I know.

19569. He goes on to state that they are listless and talkative. How could they be listless and talkative at the same time?—They were not listless and talkative, but they were talkative on one occasion. They were put sitting down on a bench and had nothing to do for a few minutes, and when children are put sitting down by themselves and nobody in charge of them it is very hard to expect anything else.

19570. In 1907, Mr. McNery reports: "The pupils are interested in their school work, and are under very good discipline." Now, had that discipline been in any way relaxed, or had it fallen away up to Mr. Welby's visit?—Not a bit, sir.

19571. Had your efforts as a teacher in any way fallen away?—Not in the slightest degree.

19572. You had your school fully up to the standard in which you got that long series of "very good"?—Quite the same, sir.

19573. So that either the judgments of all the inspectors who went before him on your school work were wrong, or Mr. Welby's was wrong?—Or all the inspectors before Mr. Welby are wrong and he is right.

19574. You consider that by the severe marking of Mr. Welby a wrong has been done to that whole circuit?—I would certainly say so.

19575. Are they entitled to redress?—Certainly.

19576. Well, there was a promise given here by Dr. Stankie that the whole case of the Council Circuit would be reviewed as that as far as possible the wrong that has been done would be righted?—I am very glad to hear it.

19577. Well, so far as you are concerned how could it be righted?—Well, money won't right my case. It has nothing to do with it.

19578. What would be the redress that would mete out adequate justice to you—you have not considered that?—Well, it is a point that I have not considered except that, perhaps, Mr. Welby's report might be cancelled.

FORTY-SECOND DAY.—FRIDAY, JULY 25TH, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—Sir SAMUEL DELL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman); The Most Rev. DESER KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross; Sir HIRAM SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN COFFEY; Mr. HENRICH E. B. HARRISON, B.A.; Mr. JEREMIAH HENLY; Mr. WALTER MCMURROUGH KAVANAGH, B.L.; Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL KEVLE, B.L.; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Miss MARY A. SWENNER, Principal of Maryke National School, County Tipperary, examined.

19379. The CHAIRMAN.—You are head mistress of Maryke National School, County Tipperary?—Yes.

19380. May I ask how long you have been in that position?—Since the 15th of September, 1902.

19381. And had you any similar position before 1902?—I was a pupil teacher in Limerick Model School.

19382. That was the beginning of your career under the National Board?—Yes.

19383. So that you have been principal only in this one school?—Yes.

19384. You have 52 children on the rolls at present?—Now there are 66.

19385. In 1910 there were 32?—Yes.

19386. And that number has risen now to 66?—Yes.

19387. And what is your grading?—Third grade.

19388. I think you have got a record of your reports here?—Yes.

19389. You want to put that record in as your evidence?—Yes.

19390. Your record begins with 1903, and you had six marks of "good" between 1903 and 1908?—Yes.

19391. The first three were given by Mr. Brown and the second three by Mr. McEnery. Is that right?—Yes.

19392. And you have reports corresponding to that mark?—Yes.

19393. The first report is that the school is promising. That is by Mr. Brown, in 1903?—Yes, I have the reports here.

19394. We may ask you for one of those. In 1904 you have, "The teacher has been attentive to her work," and in 1906 they did not give any report?—Well, I did not get it at the time. I did not get any copy of it, but it was sent, and it was "good."

19395. In 1906 Mr. McEnery says—"The teacher is industrious and efficient, and progress good." In 1907 Mr. McEnery says—"The teacher is doing good work in the instruction and training of the pupils, and the condition of the school is satisfactory." In 1908 the same inspector says—"Teaching is sound and efficient; written exercises are neatly and carefully executed." In 1909 you had no inspection at all?—I had none.

19396. Mr. HENRY.—Was that on the calendar or the school year?—The calendar year.

19397. The CHAIRMAN.—In January, 1910, Mr. Weply came to your school?—Yes.

19398. And he gave you the mark "middling"?—Yes.

19399. That is a drop of two points, is it not?—Yes.

19400. And he remarked, "Building old and cheerless"?—Yes.

19401. Now have you got his full report?—Yes.

19402. Will you hand it to me, and I will read it to the Committee?—That is Mr. Weply's full report. (Witness hands report to Chairman.)

19403. This is the report of the inspection of the 18th of January, 1910, by Mr. Weply.—"The work of this school is carried on under depressing conditions. The schoolhouse is old, gaunt, and cheerless; the out-offices are in a very unsatisfactory state, and the desks are unsuitable. The present average attendance would seem to warrant the appointment of a junior assistant mistress. The general proficiency is mediocre, and in no subject is it good. Oral composition is especially backward, the pupils not having been trained to speak audibly, distinctly, and when

necessary in sentences. Reading is hurried, monotonous, and without taste or expression, and arithmetic proved very backward. Former discipline should be maintained, and better order should be preserved, and the pupils should be trained to be prompt and alert. A new map of the world, a map of the British Isles, a globe, a scale map of the locality, are all required. There are no pictures for infants, and the supply of story readers is quite inadequate." Have you any remarks to make on that inspection?—Yes; I have put them down.

19404. Now, you say—"On the 18th of January, 1910, the senior inspector examined 27 children out of 63 on the roll. As the morning was very wet, the children were mostly from the immediate neighbourhood of the school, which is the remains of a warring district. The people were poor, and can ill afford to send the children regularly once they have reached an age at which they can be of any help at home. Many of those who were in on this day were children who had begun to be regular since the Compulsory Act was enforced, in 1902. No allowance was made for the extra labour of working up children who had come through four of the Compulsory Act. Besides, the average attendance was 35 for the second quarter of 1909, 36 for the third quarter, and 36 for the fourth, which gave me work for two, and this under very unfavourable conditions. Little wonder my store of energy was well-nigh exhausted on 18th January, 1910, when Mr. Weply examined. The reports show how I have been recompensed for the extra work." In November, 1910, Mr. Fitzpatrick examined the school. He was a sectional inspector?—Yes.

19405. He came and examined the school. Did he examine it in the same way?—Yes.

19406. And he gave you the same mark "middling"?—The same mark.

19407. And he said the tone of the work was dull?—Yes.

19408. Here is Mr. Fitzpatrick's report:—"The schoolhouse is a cheerless building, ill-furnished and ill-equipped. The general tone of work is dull, and little progress is made by the pupils. Much more attention should be paid to conversational lessons with the view to give some readiness and confidence in speaking. At all oral lessons the children should be trained to speak more freely. A globe, map of the British Islands, new map of the world and wall tablets are required. New desks are badly needed." Have you ever been put to any expense for the upkeep of that school yourself?—No.

19409. Or the equipment?—No.

19410. You never have paid anything?—No.

19411. The Bishop of Ross.—Has the equipment been improved since 1910?—We got two new maps, a globe and a blackboard.

19412. The CHAIRMAN.—But has the school been made brighter, which was described as quite cheerless?—I think that remark of Mr. Fitzpatrick is unfair to the school. The school had been newly white-washed in November, 1910, and the scrubbing of the floor was done every day. The building was cheerful in so far as being clean, and so far as cleanliness and neatness could render it cheerful, all that could be done was done; but it was a large building, and there were only 36 in it, and the desks are old.

1913 July, 1913.]

Miss MARY A. SWENNEY CHAIRMAN.

[Continued.]

19013. I suppose you have ample room for your 60 pupils?—Yes; there is room for 65, according to the 15 square feet for each child.

19014. Mr. Cowley.—Had any of the previous inspectors found fault with the building?—They had not.

19015. The CHAIRMAN.—This is Mr. McNeill's report of the inspection of 2nd of December, 1908:—"The teaching generally is sound and efficient, and the pupils are making good progress in their studies. Reading, however, still leaves room for improvement in clearness and expression, and spelling in some instances is not accurate. Penmanship is successfully taught, and the written exercises are neatly and carefully executed. Increased attention should be paid to singing, and more modelator practice should be given. Walls and ceiling of school-room require lime-washing, and the floor needs minor repairs. The roof, where it adjoins the east gable, requires consulting. The out-office is near the school-room, and its roof is out of repair. Then Mr. P. J. Fitzgerald inspected the school on 24th November, 1911, and he gave you "good."—Yes.

19016. And this is his report:—"This school has improved, and is now 'good.' The junior assistant mistress has proved herself a useful teacher. The principal is a very hard-working teacher. The relief she has been afforded by the appointment of the junior assistant mistress has enabled her to devote her energies largely to the senior standards, with good results. The school-room is very nicely equipped, particularly in respect of maps and pictures. There are no tablet rails or map rails, and the walls look very bare. One of the desks used by the junior pupils needs alterations." Then, for 1912, you had no inspection, and now we come to 1913, when Mr. Dowling gave you "fair." He reduced you one point to "fair."—Yes.

19017-8. And is his report here?—It is. (Witness hands report to Chairman.)

19019. You had a visit from Mr. McNeill before Mr. Dowling?—In February, 1913.

19020. Have you got Mr. McNeill's report?—There was no report, but there is his writing in the book here, just one noting.

19021. Mr. McNeill visited this school on the 5th of February of this year, and he made one noting—"School-room neat and tidy." Now we go on to Mr. Dowling. Mr. Dowling reduced you to "fair," and this is his report:—"The cheerfulness of the school is reflected in the pupils, who are frequently neither clean nor neat. The tone of the school, as evinced, amongst other ways, by the pupils' address, is not satisfactory. The manner and methods of the assistant are not calculated to impart vivacity and intelligence to the pupils. Some of the senior work, as the penmanship, is good. Oral English is fair on all standards. Drawing, especially in the junior division, needs attention. A large scale map and easel are needed."—Yes; he marked the school "fair," and he wrote—"There is something seriously amiss with the training in this school."

19022. Where is that written?—In the Observation Book.

19023. Here are his observations. This is dated the 5th of March of this year, and it is signed by Mr. Dowling.—"There is something seriously amiss with the training in this school. The pupils do not speak out or read with anything like the necessary amount of animation or clearness. The teachers must consider that problem, and see if it is not due to the fact that they are too inclined, by interruptions and guide questions necessitating the supply merely of a word, to do the mental phrase forming which is essential to the students' work." Did you understand this yourself?—I thought I did.

19024. Mr. Cowley.—He goes on to say:—"It is a defect the removal of which depends on school training, and not on the local environment, as some imagine. More firmness must be employed by both teachers, and a better discipline obtained. The

junior pupils are altogether too inclined to talk at desk work. The drawing lesson by junior assistant mistress had several faults; a number of pupils had crayons three-quarters of an inch long. Proper mass drawing on brown paper should be employed. In the senior division, object drawing should be introduced. Standards 1 and 2 display little skilfulness at arithmetic. Not one in standard 2 did a simple problem I gave. In senior singing class plenty of modelator work is necessary. Only one 5th standard pupil was present. Her reading was monotonous, and her knowledge of geography and analysis almost nil. I note that standard 3 have been seven months or so at English. Penmanship is good in the examination specimen and some of the books. It does not receive enough teaching in the junior classes. The epidemic of the last month has, of course, militated against the school." What length of time did Mr. McNeill spend in your school in February?—I think about an hour.

19025. The CHAIRMAN.—You say?—In November Mr. Fitzpatrick examined 26 out of 65 on the rolls. Though the children at no time answered better when under examination, a "muddling" came in due time, and was accompanied by a reprimand from the office. Have you got the reprimand?—I got it.

19026. It is always sent to the manager, as it is the business of the manager to reprimand?—He gave it to me, but I did not retain it; I burned it.

19027. Now, you say that that reprimand was to the effect that summary steps would be taken with reference to the teacher?—Yes, if progress were not shown.

19028. And you asked for a re-examination of your school?—Yes.

19029. Through the manager?—Yes.

19030. And that was refused?—Yes.

19031. You say?—At my request the manager asked for re-examination, but none would be granted. This being the case, and my hard work hitherto ignored, I did not expect any better mark at a future time, and had decided to give up teaching and take up another position. Though having (as I think and hope) a good taste for teaching, I should not have been sorry to leave it then, as 'the powers that be' were making the position intolerable, and crushing out all independence of action and spirit."—Yes.

19032. Then, in what year were you raised to "good" by Mr. Fitzgerald?—In 1911.

19033. Yes, you say?—Mr. Fitzgerald paid an incidental visit in July, 1911. A junior assistant mistress had been then three days assisting, and I showed him the junior's written work, saying, "I thought it very good." "Oh," he replied, "it is good." I showed him the seniors, saying, "I think this is very good, too." "Yes," he said, "it is good," and he wondered why I was so emphatic. "Well," I said, "I don't expect much, as the inspectors are prejudiced coming in here." However, he had already formed a favourable opinion, and at his next visit he congratulated me on the work, and said he thought the school very good. Later on, after visits from Dr. Starke and Mr. Dilworth, Mr. Hynes, Mr. Fitzgerald and Mr. Welby, the report was raised once more to "good." So Dr. Starke visited your school?—He did.

19034. How long did he stay?—About 20 minutes.

19035. And did he examine?—He looked over the written work and the drawing; he did not examine, but Mr. Dilworth examined in reading and mental arithmetic.

19036. Did Dr. Starke make any remark to you about the school?—He made no remark about the proficiency of the school.

19037. But did he say anything about the building or the equipment?—Well, he said, "It looks dusty;" and Mr. Purser, when he came in that evening, asked me what Dr. Starke said, and I replied he said, "It looks dusty," and he said, "I don't see what you can do."

19038. Mr. Cowley.—Who said that?—Mr. Purser, the chief inspector.

19040. In November you were visited by Mr. Hynes, the chief inspector?—Yes.

19040. How long did he stay?—About an hour and a half, or two hours perhaps.

19041. And you know for what purpose he had come?—Well, I knew he was in the district.

19042. That was all?—That was all.

19043. Since then you have learned a good deal more about his visit?—Yes.

19044. But at the time you did not know that?—I did not.

19045. Did he say anything bearing on this point?—He said to me—"The school is certainly on the up grade."

19046. He knew it before?—He had not stated it before in my time there.

19047. What was the report immediately before him?—It was Mr. Fitzpatrick's "middling."

19048. Mr. Hynes came in 1911. In page 215 of our appendix the marks of the schools that he visited and examined are given, and he gave you the merit mark of "middling" again?—Yes.

19049. Were you surprised at that?—I was very much surprised.

19050. THE CHAIRMAN.—Now I go on to the paragraph about the effect of reports on the teacher's salary. You say—"Since I was appointed here, in September, 1902, a third increment was due in September, 1911, but it was withheld owing to the lowering of the report by Mr. Welply in January, 1910, and Mr. Fitzpatrick in November, 1910. When the manager applied for it he got in reply, 'It will be considered in connection with the next general report,' that would be the report in 1912. No examination was held in 1912—that is, no general examination. Owing to an epidemic of whooping-cough (as certified by medical officer), the school was closed from 21st to 31st January, and the average attendance for the month was 4.8. Very soon after reopening, on 8th February, 1913, Mr. McNeill noted in the Observation Book, 'Schoolroom neat and tidy.'"

19051. Mr. CURRY.—Have you any idea, or can you give the Committee any idea, of how Mr. McNeill's noting in the Observation Book that the school-room was neat and tidy can be reconciled with the remark of the junior inspector, Mr. Dowling, (I think he was at that time an unattached inspector), as to the cheerlessness of the school?—Oh, I have no idea; I cannot account for it; it must be in himself, I think. The children had extra overcoats and other garments on on account of illness.

19052. And a good many of them were poor children in a mining district?—Yes; the children were quite tidy. Mr. McNeill said that whatever inspector came next would, of course, consider the epidemic, and that I would be getting my increment, and could be then looking forward to promotion.

19053. THE CHAIRMAN.—Then you say—"Mr. Dowling did come next. He inspected on 6th March, 1913. The average attendance for February, 1913, was 20.2. On March 2d there were present 21, on 6th March there were present 30, on 8th March there were 35, and this was the highest number since Christmas," and you say the children had on overcoats and other extra garments owing to recent illness. He marked the school "fair," and part of the minute of the report is, "The cheerlessness of the school-room is reflected in the pupils, who are frequently neither clean nor neat," and in the Observation Book, "There is something seriously amiss with the training in this school." Then you say—"Re-examination was again asked for. The manager asked for a re-examination, as my increment depended on the report, and Mr. Welply inspected and examined on 10th June, 1913, from 11.30 to 4.30." That was only last month?—Yes.

19054. You say Mr. Welply inspected and examined from half-past eleven to 4.30, and you add—"From his noting in the Observation Book little can be learned, but before he left I said, 'I hope you are pleased, Mr. Welply,' and he said, 'Well, I am, as general.' Among his observations is, 'The room is tidy.'"—Yes; and there had been no change whatever made in the room since Mr. Dowling visited.

19055. This is the noting of Mr. Welply—"Visited on 10/6/13 from 11.30 to 4.30; 39 percent. 1. The teaching of reading and writing to infants does not proceed on proper lines. 2. Mass drawing is to be taken up again. 3. Satchels are not to be worn in school. 4. First and second standards ought to read the same books. 5. The room is tidy, and the pupils to-day are fairly neat. 6. Oral composition has certainly improved, but it needs further improvement, as Mr. Dowling advised, the pupils are to make fuller answers to questions. 7. Pay attention to spelling in second standard. 8. Teach pupils to recognize words by their syllables. See what Mr. Fitzgerald wrote, also about sound values, on page 29. For example, 'diplomatist' ought not to be a difficult word to pupils taught in that way, nor should 'implacable' nor 'confederation.'" Now, Mr. Fitzgerald visited on the 20th of June, 1913?—Yes.

19056. And this is what he says—"Inspected 9.40 to 11.15. Room is as well kept as circumstances permit. Pupils were punctual in arrival, and were orderly while in school. Do not allow the pupils to chatter when they are engaged at silent reading. Do not hear home lessons as at present. Take the different subjects as the lessons to which they relate turn up during the school day. Make lessons in geography more interesting. (See Notes for Teachers.) At present there seems to be much time given to lists in text books. Do not mix exercises of different kinds in the same book. If separate books cannot be secured, portions of the exercise book should be reserved for the different subjects. Corrections should not be made by the teacher. See faulty and ungrammatical sentences in composition should be written correctly in full after each day's exercise. Use brown paper and stencils for infants' drawing, and connect this lesson with the story lesson. In senior group give more practice at drawing from objects, and try to have the papers kept clean. School seems to be doing generally satisfactory work." Now this is the last note. That finished your record?—Yes.

19057. Have you got any further mark in consequence of these visits—you had two visits in June, and did you get any merit mark?—Oh, I got no merit mark; I have heard nothing since.

19058. But you may hear, having regard to the interval that elapses some times?—I do not know.

19059. THE BRISOR or ROSS.—Did you regard either of these as a formal inspection or a mere incidental visit?—I think Mr. Welply came for re-examination. Father Humphreys applied for re-examination, so I think Mr. Welply came for that.

19060. Father Humphreys is your manager?—Yes.

19061. THE CHAIRMAN.—You take it that that visit of Mr. Welply was the re-examination that your manager asked for?—Yes. What he has in the Observation Book is "Visited."

19062. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—You say Mr. McNeill said that "Whatever inspector came next would, of course, consider the epidemic, and that you would be getting your increment, and could be then looking forward to promotion." Mr. McNeill said that?—Yes, he said that.

19063. Is there anything more?—Well, in the volume of evidence published, in page 214, Mr. Welply says in the second paragraph—"I never previously heard that Miss Sweeney had applied for a re-examination of her school, and it is to be noted that Mr. Fitzpatrick could give her no better award in November, 1910, than I gave her in January, 1910; but I am glad to learn from Mr. Fitzgerald that since the appointment of a junior assistant here the school has advanced greatly in merit." There he is giving the credit to the junior assistant, and when Mr. P. J. Fitzgerald called in July, the junior assistant was with me only three days—on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday morning. It was then that I showed him the juniors' written work, and he said it was good, and that the seniors' work was good, and he said to me at the time, "The school is bound to go up." Now, she could not have done wonders in three days. Certainly, she is a very helpful and useful teacher, but she was there only three days that morning.

19065. THE CHAIRMAN.—What Mr. Welpy said is that he is glad to hear from Mr. Fitzgerald that since the appointment of a junior assistant the school has advanced greatly in merit?—It was an incidental visit then, but he came again in October to observe the junior assistant, and the junior assistant had then eight weeks' service given, and he congratulated me on the work, and said, "This school is certainly very good," and he would mark it very good.

19066. Mr. HENRY.—Who said that?—Mr. Fitzgerald. I said, "Will you mark it to-day, Mr. Fitzgerald?" and he said, "I will call again," and he called again on the 24th of November (this was after Dr. Starke and Mr. Dilworth and Mr. Hynes and all the others had been there), and he gave the mark "good."

19067. THE CHAIRMAN.—Though you expected "very good" from his conversation?—Yes.

19068. And he came after the visit of Dr. Starke and Mr. Hynes?—And all the others.

19069. THE HONORABLE MEMBER.—How long had your junior assistant mistress been in the school on the 24th of November?—Eight weeks in October.

19070. That would be three months?—Thirteen weeks.

19071. That visit of Mr. Fitzgerald, that examination of the school, was subsequent to the date of Mr. Welpy's writing of that letter. It was in 1911 you got the junior assistant mistress?—July, 1911.

19072. It was on the 24th of November, 1911, that Mr. Fitzgerald examined the school?—Yes.

19073. And he gave you that report. But this letter was written by Mr. Welpy on the 24th of October, 1911, and he could not have got the information from Mr. Fitzgerald after Mr. Fitzgerald's last visit to the school, and, therefore, you are correct that he must have based his judgment on the eight weeks?—On the eight weeks.

19074. And the dates bear that out?—Yes.

19075. SIR HYAM WILKINSON.—There is one conclusion that would seem to be deducible from that—that you had not received sufficient consideration in your earlier reports for the absence of an assistant mistress, to which your numbers would then outside you?—Yes.

19076. The report would seem to have taken into consideration every defect which might fairly have been attributed to the absence of sufficient assistance given to you?—Yes; there was no consideration made for it.

19077. For the absence of the assistance?—For the extra work.

19078. At any rate, you were on the point of being entitled to an assistant mistress, and your average number was only raised slightly afterwards?—Yes. The reverend manager, Father Humphreys, told me that when the re-examination was refused the cause of the refusal was not sent to him, and that what Mr. Dilworth stated in his evidence on that point was correct.

19079. Mr. CONYER.—Father Humphreys said that Mr. Dilworth had accurately stated that the senior inspector's report on a re-examination was not sent to the manager?—That the cause of the refusal of re-examination were not sent to him, but the refusal only was sent.

19080. Looking at page 214 of the Blue Book, would you like to make any remarks upon Mr. Welpy's observations with regard to your school? He says—"Home lessons, fourth and fifth. Infants sat on a form by the wall trying to write on slates though there was ample room in the desks. Other pupils not occupied at all." That is after "twenty minutes?"—I have forgotten the visit.

19081. And there was no observation made in the Observation Book that would call your attention to that at the time?—None.

19082. "10.30 to 11. Infants put for drawing in high desks at far end of the room; an elm leaf put on the blackboard, but not a word of teaching. Principal read dictation at this time for fourth and fifth standards." Had you got your assistant at that time?—I had not. I had none.

19083. You were reading dictation to the fourth and fifth standards, and Mr. Welpy thinks you ought at the same time to have been teaching the infants drawing?—Yes; I should have been in two places.

19084. That is rather difficult. Then, "11 to 11.30, second and third. Reading monotonous. Pupils held down their heads, and hasty along. No teaching of this." Have you any recollection of that?—I cannot remember the examination at all.

19085. "Teacher leads pupils by the hand at class movements?"—Perhaps I took one of the little children; perhaps when a child would be inclined to fall about I helped him along, a little infant. I dare say that is what I did.

Mr. HENRY.—That is a serious offence.

19086. SIR HYAM WILKINSON.—That is considered very bad?—Well, it is by Mr. Welpy.

19087. But you do not consider it very bad, do you?—I do not, because it is necessary very often.

19088. THE CHAIRMAN.—What would be the ages of those children?—Some of them 8 and $8\frac{1}{2}$ and 4—the children from the immediate neighbourhood, who come in when very young.

19089. THE HONORABLE MEMBER.—Were you a pupil in a National School yourself?—I was.

19090. What school was that?—Lissock, County Kerry.

19091. How many years were you pupil teacher in the Limerick Model School?—Two years; 1888 to 1900.

19092. Had you been a mistress in the school in which you were a pupil?—No; I got to Lissock Model School at the age of 26.

19093. And you became a principal then?—I went to the Training College.

19094. And you were two years in training?—Two years.

19095. And your training was from 1900 to 1902, I suppose?—Yes.

19096. And then you were appointed as principal at Mardyeke immediately afterwards?—Yes.

19097. Of course, the old classification system had ceased when you were after training?—It had.

19098. What division did you come out in?—There was no division then.

19099. There were marks given at that time?—Yes, I made the marks that used to entitle teachers to special distinction; I made over 50 per cent. of marks.

19100. So that you got special distinction?—I got special distinction and I got my diploma.

19101. Is there a boys' school at Mardyeke?—It is a mixed school.

19102. Is your school a mixed school of boys and girls?—Yes.

19103. Then you went up in 1911. Would the arrival of the assistant mistress have anything to do with that?—Well, it was gradually going up for two or three years.

19104. It was practically stationary up to 1909, almost stationary?—Yes.

19105. The numbers were 22, 20, 21, 20, 25?—Yes.

19106. Then it went up in 1909 by 8 pupils to 33, and next year there were 32.

19107. And then it got a jump again in 1911 to 39?—Yes.

19108. That was the best average. Then apparently the application of the compulsory clause in 1909 added 8 to your number?—Yes.

19109. And then you got up again, and would the junior assistant mistress's arrival have anything to say to that?—I think not. She was a help.

19110. What distance would the other schools be from Mardyeke?—One school is a mile and a half or two miles; there is another about three miles off, and a third school between three and four.

19111. Suppose that Mardyeke school did not exist, what would be the longest distance that any of the children that go to you would have to travel?—I think about two miles.

19112. Two miles only?—Yes.

19113. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Were there any complaints among the teachers before Mr. Welpy arrived?—I heard of none. There were none.

25th July, 1915.]

Miss MARY A. SWENBY examined.

[Continued.]

19714. And the trouble began the minute Mr. Welply arrived in the Clemond circuit?—All my trouble.

19715. Can you tell me was there much difference in his mode of examination from Mr. Brown's, for instance, or Mr. McKenry's?—He examined more on the old results system style of examination. Mr. Brown did more inspection.

19716. You would not complain of that—you would not have complained of more examination and less inspection?—Well, I would not.

19717. Did his manner seem to disconcert the children in any way—do you think that he got as much out of them as Mr. Brown would have, for instance?—I had no fault to find with his manner. He seemed a bit suspicious; that was all.

19718. And the only fault you really had to find with him was that he lowered the mark two points?—Yes, and did not consider the circumstances.

19719. What was that lowering based on—was it the answering of the children (as you say nearly all his inspection was examination, it must have been on the answering of the children)?—Well, he seems to have taken the tone and the building and everything into consideration.

19720. Well, the premises seem to have impressed the inspector as well as the children. Are the premises very good?—The building is a good one, and so far as the manager can keep it up and do his part, getting it white-washed and the out-offices cleaned, he seems anxious to do it; but it is an old building.

19721. Is it one room?—Yes; there were two.

19722. And now that you have got an assistant, have you to teach in the same room?—Yes.

19723. Boys and girls all together?—Yes.

19724. There is no way of putting up a partition?—Well, it is one long room.

19725. Now, have you anything farther to bring before the Committee which you would like to put before us?—I think there is nothing else, only that I feel, of course, that a great injustice has been done to me in the lowering of the mark.

19726. And you complain also that when you appealed no notice was taken of your appeal?—Yes, and I have lost some money. I have lost money on account of the lowering of the mark.

19727. You lost increment?—I lost increment. I have already lost £14.

19728. Sir HARVEY WILKINSON.—You have lost two increments?—I don't know about the last report, whether I will get one or not.

19729. But by £14 you mean two years of the increment that you would have got?—Next September £14 that would have come.

19730. Mr. HENRY.—You were described in 1909 as being industrious and efficient. You were described in 1910 as doing good work in training pupils well, and the condition of the school was described as satisfactory; and the teaching the following year was described as sound and efficient, and the written exercises as being neatly and carefully executed. Now, did you fall away in any respect from the standard of work that you had attained in that school during those three years?—I think my character as a teacher was then formed, and what I was then I am now, and have been since.

19731. Did you work with equal zeal and assiduity?—Yes.

19732. And while you were getting those reports your merit mark for the school was "good"?—Yes.

19733. And then Mr. Welply came into the circuit in 1909, and when he examined your school in 1910 was the proficiency of the pupils and the general arrangements of the school, the discipline and the order, as satisfactory in your opinion as they had been in previous years?—I think so, but irregular children had come in during 1909, and the working up of these might have lowered the general proficiency, but it was accounted for by the children having come in.

19734. Now, you are aware that when the inspector is drawing up his report he is supposed to take into consideration all adverse circumstances and to make allowance for them in his report?—Yes.

19735. You think that one of the adverse circumstances was, that you got in a number of larger pupils that had been more or less waste and stayed until the Compulsory Act was enforced?—Yes.

19736. And that these may have lowered the character of the school somewhat?—Yes.

19737. Did you call Mr. Welply's attention to the facts that you had got these in?—I did.

19738. Did he show any intention to take that factor into consideration?—I think he showed none.

19739. He describes the building as old and cheerless. Do you think that taken into consideration in writing the report?—Well, I don't know.

19740. You don't know whether it was taken into consideration in your favour or against you?—I do not know. If anything, it would have been against.

19741. In the following year you got "mildling"?—Again.

19742. That was, of course, Mr. Fitzpatrick?—Yes.

19743. He was a sectional inspector working under Mr. Welply?—Yes.

19744. And, therefore, could not raise the mark without the concurrence of Mr. Welply?—Yes.

19745. Now, Mr. Fitzpatrick visited you in 1911, and he says here that "the principal is very hard-working, and a fine spirit of industry prevails." Was there any improvement, any real improvement, as far as you are aware as compared with the state of the school when Mr. Welply lowered the mark to "mildling"?—There were two teachers there then, and, of course, there were two lessons, going on at a time, and I could devote my energy to the scholars, and I had not to think so much about the rest of the school, but the spirit of industry was the same then as before.

19746. Would not your industry have been greater if you were able to teach efficiently 25 pupils in 1908?—Well, I had sufficient to do then. I had too much to do before 1911.

19747. Now, we have, "The cheerfulness of the schoolroom is reflected in the pupils, who are frequently neither clean nor neat." Do you think that was taken into consideration by Mr. Dowling in your favour or against you when he lowered your mark again to "fair"?—I think it was taken against me.

19748. Can you reconcile the different statements of the different inspectors with any supposition that we have anything like the uniformity in the marking of the schools?—I think if there was uniformity these observations could not be there.

19749. Do you think, then, that your school had its mark unjustly lowered?—Yes.

19750. And that there was an injustice done to you whereby you suffered a loss of money?—Yes.

19751. Now, Dr. Starke has told us that he means to review the whole circumstances of that Clemond circuit, and to do justice, as far as is possible, to right the wrong that has been done. What do you think should be done in your case?—Well, in the first place, the character of the teacher should have been "good" during the whole term of my teaching, and then any increment that was to follow should be paid, any money that has been kept back. That is my idea of justice. And in 1911 I think the report should have been "very good," and it would have been had it not been previously lowered.

19752. Now, when your manager applied for a re-examination of the school you told us that he made the observation that Mr. Dilworth's remarks, as published in the Blue Book, were correct. Did he refer to any of the other officials?—He said that what Mr. Wyse said was not correct.

19753. The CHAIRMAN.—Who said that?—Father Humphreys.

19754. Mr. HENRY.—Have you any objection to giving us Father Humphreys's words?—When I asked him for permission to attend the Committee of Inquiry, he said:—"You might state that I asked for a re-examination of the school for the teacher and it was refused, and the reasons for refusal were not sent to me. What Mr. Bonaparte Wyse said in his evidence in that respect was not correct, and what Mr. Dilworth said was true."

20th July, 1956.]

Miss Mary A. Sweeney examined.

[Continued.]

19750-6. Did you find any of his observations useful?—I did not. He put us from teaching drawing as we were teaching it, and on lines which Mr. Fitzgerald had recommended. He did not give any idea of how the work should be done.

19757. Did you find any of the suggestions helpful to you in any way?—No, not a bit helpful.

19758. So that while you got in that book a number of what may be called pin-jackets or tent-huggings, you got no suggestion of any real value, and no information as to make your teaching more efficient?—None. And he has mentioned 5th class geography taught in seven months. There was only one pupil present, and that child had been away for a few months previous owing to whooping-cough.

Mr. MICHAEL O'DONNELL, Assistant Teacher, Moyland

19759. The CHAIRMAN.—You are assistant teacher in Moyland National School?—Yes.

19760. How long have you been in that position?—Over 35 years.

19761. And you began your career as teacher in that school?—Yes, no change.

19762. And where were you educated?—In that school.

19763. So you have been there all the 35 years?—All the time.

19764. And longer?—The fact of the matter is it is nearly 40.

19765. And the head master is Mr. Ryan?—Yes, he has just gone out a year ago.

19766. Who is your present head master?—His son, who was educated in Blackrock, and then in St. Patrick's Training College.

19767. What are the numbers in average attendance at the school?—The average is 60 at present; it was once over 100, some years ago.

19768. Is it situated in a village?—It is a mile from Limerick Junction.

19769. Is it a populous district?—Well, it is a pretty populous district, but the population has gone down within the last few years.

19770. You say that at one time your numbers rose to over 100?—Over 100. We once had 120, I think, examined.

19771. And how many assistants had you at that time?—Well, there were two for some time, for a few years.

19772. You served under the whole of the results' system?—Not quite; I was appointed in 1874 as assistant.

19773. Just after it had been introduced?—Yes, I think it was introduced in 1872.

19774. And as to your emoluments, I suppose your emoluments did not change on the introduction of the new system?—Well, not immediately, for three years after I got an increment of 27.

19775. Oh, you rose?—Yes, under the new system. I got three increments till I came to the maximum.

19776. You got three increments since 1907?—Yes.

19777. And that brought you to the maximum of your grade?—The maximum, eighty-four.

19778. And you cannot get any higher in third grade?—No.

19779. And you cannot get any higher grade as you are an assistant. You are an untrained teacher?—I am untrained.

19780. What is your principal object in coming before us to-day?—Well, to defend my character as a teacher from what Mr. Welply wrote.

19781. The passage you refer to, I understand, is that which appears in Mr. Welply's report at page 213 of the Blue Book?—Yes. His assistant is a most untrained teacher, he says to his colleague, Mr. Fitzgerald, will also tell the Board?—Yes, and if you will allow me to read my statement it would make the matter clear, and it won't take me very long. During upwards of 35 years' work in Moyland School I had given highly satisfactory service. I have here reports of various inspectors during 20 years in proof of this. These I propose to have printed, to refute the libel on my professional character, given in Mr. Welply's statement in

Boys' National School, County Tipperary, examined.

the first volume of evidence, namely, that I am "a most inefficient teacher." The report was expensively lowered by Mr. Welply on a "results" examination held in the middle of the school year, on the first day after the Christmas vacation and without notice. In the report there was no fault found with the principal elementary subjects, reading, writing, arithmetic, etc. Mr. Brown and Mr. McEnery inspected and examined in the spirit of the new programme. Mr. Welply's was a searching "results" examination. The difference in requirements was unfair to the teacher when no notice was given. This was deplorable, and I could not have the same enthusiasm in my school work as formerly. In the Blue Book, page 213 (Appendix), Mr. Welply says "Assistant is a most untrained teacher," and the principal, he says, is no longer able to teach effectively, and he refers to Mr. Fitzgerald in support of his views. Yet, at the very next examination held in the school the same year (December 1911), Mr. Fitzgerald raised the mark from "fair" to "good," and this is confirmed by Mr. Welply. No change of teachers. The pupils were at least as well taught in the previous year. Then I give a list of six-year reports since 1902. In 1902 the mark was "excellent," in 1903 "good," in 1904 "good," in 1905 "very good," in 1906 "very good," in 1907 "very good," in 1908 "good," in 1909 "very good," and in 1910 "good."

19782. And then in January, 1911, Mr. Welply gave you "fair," and in December, 1911, Mr. Fitzgerald gave you "good"?—Yes.

19783. Then you refer to inconsistencies in Mr. Welply's marking?—Yes. See extract from notes made on the observation book in July, 1910, giving general praise to the school work, and contrast it with the report given six months later, January, 1911, when he reduces report. Mr. Welply's incidental visit took place in July, 1910.

19784. You refer to what he says in July, 1910?—Yes.

19785. "This school makes a favourable impression, the instruction being sound and intelligent. The exercises are of 'good' to 'very good' quality, and I am glad to find attention is being given to elementary science?"—This exact words of Mr. Welply.

19786. Then as to delays in reports you say—"Mr. Welply examined on 9th and 10th January, 1911, and his report was issued on 15th March, 1911" (that is two months later or more). "Mr. Fitzgerald examined on the 8th and 14th December, 1911, and his report was issued on the 10th March, 1912" (the interval there was longer). Have you been accustomed to what all through your school career?—As far as I remember now.

19787. Is the interval between the inspection and the issue of the report longer than it used to be?—Oh, no doubt.

19788. Of late years is it growing longer?—Well, it is only in these two instances that I have taken out.

19789. You say, "The vice-marshal applied for exemption from Rule 137 (b) on the ground that the position of the assistant, who had given upwards of a quarter of a century doing highly satisfactory work, would be endangered through non-enrolment of the boys under seven years. The girls' school, too, had,

26th July, 1913.]

Mr. MICHAEL O'DONNELL examined.

[Continued.]

and still less, but one room. Exemption was refused by the Board, as the following letter shows:—

"Office of National Education,
Dublin, 11th June, 1906.

Rev. Sir,—With reference to your letter of the 6th ult., requesting that the above-named school be exempted from the operation of Rule 127 (b), I am directed to inform you that there appears to be no sufficient reason to apprehend that the position of the assistant teacher in the school will be rendered insecure by the application of this rule. I have, accordingly, to express regret that your request cannot be complied with.—I am, Rev. Sir, your obedient servant, W. J. DILLWORTH, Secretary. To Rev. T. O'Dwyer, P.P., Salsburgh, Tipperary."

19790. Did the inspector come round to make enquiries about that?—Yes, both the district and senior inspectors.

19791. And on their report that letter was issued, I suppose?—Yes.

19792. Mr. HENLY.—What was your average attendance at that time?—Well, a little over 10.

19793. The CHAIRMAN.—You say, "When the inspector came to intimate that the rule should be enforced, he told the assistant that the boys should return if the average were undamaged by the rule, but 127 (a) was enforced from 1st July, 1906. The following table shows the effects on the average attendance:—1904, 69.8; 1905, 72.9; 1906, 69.1; 1907, 49.6; 1908, 52.3; 1909, 51.3; 1910, 50.7; 1911, 52.7—Yes, that shows the effect."

19794. Mr. CORRY.—Who was the inspector that told you that the boys would return if the average undamaged your position?—Mr. McEnery.

19795. The CHAIRMAN.—Mr. McEnery, you say, told you that?—Yes.

19796. He positively assured you?—Of course, I took his word. I remember the words distinctly.

19797. What were the words?—That the boys should return from the girls' school if there was fear of the attendance going below 50.

19798. The BRUCE or ROSE.—Do you remember how many infant boys were sent out to the girls' school at the time?—There were no boys sent out to the girls' school, my lord, at the time; it was only to the boys under seven who were coming on in the future that the rule applied.

19799. I suppose not fewer than 20 very small boys?—I used to have over 20 sometimes, sometimes less and sometimes more.

19800. Mr. CORRY.—The letter of the Board to the Manager, Father O'Dwyer, would seem to be on the same lines as the Inspector's assurance, because they say that there appears to be at present no sufficient reason to apprehend that the position of the assistant teacher of the school would be rendered insecure by the application of the rule?—Yes.

19801. The CHAIRMAN.—Then on page 4 you say—"For the quarter ended 30th September, 1909, the average attendance was below 50, a direct result of the rule, and the assistant teacher was, the next quarter, to be dismissed if the average was below 50. The guarantee given by the Inspector was not made and the rule, undisturbed during the previous service, was not to be enforced to cast him on the roadside, as the following letter plainly proves:—"County Tipperary. Bell No. 400. School, Monard. The attention of the manager is directed to the fact that the average attendance of pupils at the above-named school for the quarter ended 30/9/08 failed to reach the minimum required by the Commissioners' Rules for payment of an assistant, and that should the attendance for current quarter be also insufficient the grant of salary to Mr. M. O'Donnell will have to be cancelled from 31/12/09.—F. E. LEMASS, W. J. DILLWORTH, Secretaries. Office of National Education, Dublin, 12th November, 1908." By great efforts the average was raised and the assistant retained." Can you tell us what was done to raise the average?—Well, the manager did all he could, and he announced the matter from the altar.

19802. Mr. CORRY.—Was any letter written to the Board at that time reminding them of this guarantee of the inspector?—No.

19803. The CHAIRMAN.—You did not remonstrate with the Board, or your message did not?—No. I wish to say that Father O'Dwyer is an invalid, but his intellect is unimpaired. When the parents become aware of the state of affairs they sent their children to school more regularly than before.

19804. Here are losses that you say have been caused to you:—First, loss of capitulation to assistant. Second, threatened loss of position in defiance of vested rights, and the inspector's guarantee, without which the manager would not have permitted the rule to be enforced. Third, mental worry, owing to threatened loss of position. The teacher's health and peace of mind were injuriously affected, and his work must have somewhat suffered in consequence. Fourth, had the average remained below 50 the school would have lost the services of a certificated assistant, and thus all the pupils, even the seniors, would have suffered?—Yes.

19805. What is your pecuniary loss exactly, for you have reached the maximum of your grade?—Well, of course, the capitulation, amounting to an average of between 42 and 43.

19806. This is by the reduction of those 20 boys you lost a certain amount of capitulation?—Yes.

19807. The BRUCE or ROSE.—The principal teacher is paid capitulation on how many?—On 60.

19808. Mr. CORRY.—If I understood your position rightly, you are not here to complain so much of financial loss as of the remarks of Mr. Weply with regard to your efficiency?—Yes, that is perfectly true, reducing my position under 127 (b), and, worse than all, Mr. Weply's unjustifiable description of me.

19809. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, we come to a kind of appendix to your paper giving the reports from 1900; but do you think there would be any good in our going back beyond 1900?—Well, Sir Samuel, I wish to show the high quality of the school for a long series of years.

19810. The report for 1890 is—"This school maintains its high reputation for efficiency. Strict discipline and order are maintained, and the boys are self-reliant whilst under examination." In 1891—"This school maintains its high reputation for the sound instruction and careful moral training which its pupils receive. The answering in the oral part of the examination was excellent, and the written work was executed with neatness and precision." In 1892—

"The juniors have made very good progress during the year. Discipline and order are carefully attended to, and the moral tone of the school is high." In 1893—

"The general proficiency most satisfactory, no defect being observed calling for any remark." In 1894—

"The general proficiency of the classes was remarkably good. Discipline and order are carefully attended to, and the conduct of the boys was most exemplary." In 1895—"This is a large and well taught school.

The answering throughout the different classes was most satisfactory. Due attention is given to discipline and order, and the boys are self-reliant whilst under examination." In 1896—"This school is well taught. The answering of all the classes show diligent and thorough preparation. Discipline and order are well maintained, and the excellent moral training which the pupils received is a splendid feature of this school." These are all from the same inspector, Mr. O'Leary. He seems to have been a good many years coming to this school?—A good many years, and he knew the school thoroughly and the teachers.

19811. Then in 1897—"The answering afforded evidence of careful teaching during the past year. Moral tone good, and order well maintained. There in 1898 you had a new inspector who says—"The teachers have performed their duties efficiently during the past result period. In all classes the answering was good. Order is well preserved. In 1899 he says—"The teaching staff continue to do good work in the school." In 1900—"The pupils of this school are highly classified; the preservation of order is excellent, and the pupils are generally intelligent." In 1901 (May) he says—"The school curriculum has been rather limited during the past six months, as so instruction has been given in geography or elementary science." What was the merit mark for that year?—

There was no merit mark at that time. That was May, 1901, and I think the new programme was just the October before.

19012. Then I find that in 1902 there was the merit mark for "excellent," and I find in 1903 the merit mark "good," and the inspector says—"The results of the year's work are generally good, and show the pupils are deriving much benefit from the training they receive?"—Yes.

19013. The HONORABLE MEMBER.—That change from "excellent" to "good" was only one step at that time, as there was then no "very good"?—That is so, my lord.

19014. The CHAIRMAN.—But still it was a step. You had an incidental visit in February, 1903, and the inspector says—"The work proceeds regularly, and the school is conducted on sound lines and with high aims." That is from Mr. McIlwain?—Yes.

19015. Then there is another incidental visit in September, 1903, on which the inspector says—"I was much pleased with the general work and tone of the school. All subjects appear to be well and carefully taught?"—Yes.

19016. Mr. COVAT.—That was a different inspector?—Yes, that was the first and last visit of Mr. Stokes.

19017. The CHAIRMAN.—Then you had Mr. McIlwain again in 1904, and he gave the mark "good," and again in 1905?—Yes. In 1905 the mark is "very good."

19018. And it is "very good" in 1906, "very good" in 1907, "very good" in 1908, and "very good" in 1909?—Yes.

19019. Mr. COFFEY.—Was 1908 "good" or "very good"?—I really think it was "good."

19020. The CHAIRMAN.—In 1909 you got "very good," and the inspector says—"This school is maintained in an efficient condition." And then he makes a remark which I deprecate. Mr. O'Donnell, you want emphasized, that is, that in 1909, Mr. McIlwain reports—"The work of the assistant is of good average quality, and shows careful preparation." You want stress laid on that?—If you please.

19021. Then we have Mr. Welby. Is this Mr. Welby's first visit to you in July, 1910?—Yes.

19022. He says—"This school makes a favorable impression, the instruction being sound and intelligent. The exercises are of 'good' to 'very good' quality, and I am glad to find attention is being given to elementary science." And then in 1910 Mr. Fitzpatrick gave you a "good" only. He says—"On the whole, good work is done and good progress made. Written exercises are good. The houses and premises are neat." Now, that finishes your paper. Have you anything more to say?—Well, the original letters from the Board. If it is necessary to produce them. I have always attended to my duty with strict conscientiousness and promptness, and to do me justice I really believe that that report should be withdrawn. I feel it very much, for I did not relax my efforts. I love my young charges, and I did not relax in the least.

19023. You mean those words of Mr. Welby?—Those words. I believe it is only mere justice to me that those words should be withdrawn.

19024. Your principal says in his note on page 208 of the Blue Book—"The impression rightly or wrongly made on my mind, owing to the methods and manner displayed by Mr. Welby during the course of his prolonged stay, was that the examination was not meant to ascertain the real worth of the teacher's work?"—That is the principal's opinion.

19025. Have you talked that over with the principal?—Oh, yes, but I have not for a long time. The principal is gone out for twelve months and more.

19026. Mr. COFFEY.—But did not the principal, though the school was only marked "fair," get a year or two of additional service?—Yes, after the school was marked "fair."

19027. Did he get two years?—The 30th of June last he went out, he retired.

19028. Sir HIRSH WITKOWSKI.—Mr. Welby's remarks are dated the 26th of October, 1911. On that date

he says—"Mr. Ryan was a good teacher. He has got one or two years' extension of service beyond the age of 65. He has failed very much physically, and is no longer able to teach effectively." Now, when did Mr. Ryan retire, as a fact?—On the 30th of June, 1912.

19029. What was the date of the "fair" given by Mr. Welby, was it not the 9th of January, 1911?—Yes.

19030. And the extension would be, I believe, year by year?—I think it was more than a year on one occasion, and less than a year on another. I think he got extensions four times altogether.

19031. The HONORABLE MEMBER.—So that his regular time had expired before this extension in January, 1911?—Yes.

19032. He was then under extension?—Yes.

19033. Sir HIRSH WITKOWSKI.—Inasmuch as this "fair" was given on the 9th of January, 1911, and Mr. Ryan retired in June, 1912, the presumption probably would be that he had received a year's extension subsequent to the mark "fair" on his school?—Very probably.

19034. You know nothing to the contrary?—No.

19035. The HONORABLE MEMBER.—You mentioned that you were not quite clear whether Mr. Ryan's extension was year by year, or whether he got a longer period of extension than a year?—I know that on one occasion he got a less period, and I think on another occasion he got a year and a quarter.

19036. But your main trouble is not so much about the mark he gave the school itself as the remark he made about you?—That is the real thing I care about. As far as the financial loss it never troubled me.

19037. The school had a high character from the reports it received, and very frequently your own personal work in the junior classes was often praised?—Invariably, my lord.

19038. In view of that, you consider it very hard that Mr. Welby should have made this remark about you, and that it was very unfair and unjust?—Yes, and quite naturally, and I am authorized by the venerable parish priest, who, for over a quarter of a century, has governed the parish where I was born, to say that my character as a teacher, or in any other direction, requires no defence before him; nor does it require defence before the people amongst whom I have lived and laboured.

19039. Mr. COFFEY.—Do you think that that mark of the school, the reduction from "good" to "fair" was unjust?—I am convinced that it is unjust.

19040. There is only one other question that I want to ask you. When you saw this memorandum of Mr. Welby's about Monasee School did you regard the closing paragraph of Mr. Welby's memorandum as a threat?—It would be more sensible on the part of the assistant to abstain from complaints?—Yes.

19041. How did you regard that?—I could not help regarding that as a bit sinister. I do not like using strong language, but it looked like a threat.

19042. I think it is open to only one reading?—I think so, sir.

19043. Mr. HENLY.—As far as you know, have there been any observations made in the observation book calling attention to any defects in the class you were teaching?—Well, Mr. Welby calls attention to the singing and object lessons, but really the examination was held at a most unsuitable time of the year.

19044. I am asking specially in reference to the other inspectors?—Well, there is no doubt that some small portion of the work was criticised, but never any of the most important subjects, and I did everything I could for the success of the school, and I even went six evenings in the week for five miles in the depth of winter to get instruction in the tonic sol-fa system. I used to sing a little in the local choir, and I was delighted and anxious to master the tonic sol-fa system.

19045. We have a series of excellent reports on your school here from 1902 to 1910, and, therefore, the school as a whole must have been very satisfactory?—Yes, no doubt.

19846. What I want to know is this. Was there any discrimination made with regard to the junior division that you were in charge of?—Well, I remember Mr. McEnery referred me to the Notes for Teachers on a couple of occasions with regard to object lessons and some other matters.

19847. In other words, there was nothing in the records of the school to justify Mr. Weply in making this assertion, that the assistant is a most indifferent teacher?—There is nothing whatever in the report from which a man would conclude that I was indifferent at all.

19848. Now, as he says here, "as my colleague, Mr. Fitzgerald, will also tell the Board," had Mr. Fitzgerald any means of judging the work?—He examined the school in December, 1912 (and I am sorry I did not give the report in full), and he gave "good" to the school (Mr. Fitzgerald 416), and I will just give you the report in short. He said the boys got good training, but he found fault with the juniors for the way they held the pencils in drawing, and with the seniors, that geography was not taught interestingly.

19849. In 1900 Mr. McEnery says that your work is of good average quality, and shows careful preparation?—Yes.

Mr. MICHAEL O'GRADY, Principal of Templemore National School, County Tipperary, examined.

19850. The CHAIRMAN.—I think you have only sent us one sheet with regard to the examination of your school on the 26th of September, 1910, which occupies two pages in our appendix?—Yes.

19851. How long have you been principal of Templemore?—Since September of the year 1911.

19852. And had you any school before that?—Yes, I was an assistant in the Cashel Union National School.

19853. Was that your first appointment?—Yes.

19854. When did you enter the service of the Board?—In September, 1891.

19855. That was 22 years ago?—Yes.

19856. So you were under the monitor system?—Yes.

19857. What are the numbers in that school?—Of course, the number varies, but the average at present is about 40.

19858. What is the highest you ever had?—50 or 51 or thereabouts.

19859. Have you an assistant?—A junior assistant mistress.

19860. You wish to draw our attention to page 200 of our appendix, and pages 212 and 203?—Yes.

19861. Now, on page 200, in the second column, does G. refer to your school?—Yes.

19862. "This school is in charge of a first of first class trained teacher." You are first of first class?—Yes.

19863. And how long have you been that?—I believe from 1900. In the year 1900 I got first of first.

19864. Under the new system?—No, by examination.

19865. What grade are you under the new system?—Really, I don't know what grade I am; my salary is £115.

19866. That is what you had on the average of three years before 1900. Your salary was £110?—Yes.

19867. And that is the salary that you have now?—Yes, in addition to the capitation grant and the Burrell grant.

19868. And what do you reckon your whole income now to be?—About £130 or thereabouts.

19869. And you don't know what grade you hold now?—According to the salary I think I am in the second grade. This certificate appears in the first part of the observation book; and different inspectors have looked at it, and they never have made any remark about what my grade was, and they still call first class or grade first of first. Mr. Brown made that entry here, first of first.

19870. Mr. HENRY.—What does not refer to the grading?—I am referring to what appears in the column, "class or grade."

19871. And then Mr. Weply, on his first visit to the school, says—This school makes a favourable impression, the instruction being sound and intelligent. "The exercises run of 'good' to 'very good' quality, and I am glad to find attention is being given to elementary science." Now, there is discrimination there in the description of your work, and, therefore, as far as I can see, there is no justification for this statement, that the assistant is a most indifferent teacher, for how a most indifferent teacher could produce such satisfactory work is one of the enigmas that have come before us?—It is strange.

19872. The CHAIRMAN.—Had you any friction with Mr. Weply while he was inspecting the school?—Not the slightest.

19873. Nothing to complain of in his manner?—No; he thanked me on the first occasion, and I do not think I was ever flustered by an inspector before.

19874. You have no unpleasant recollections of anything that happened then?—No; it is only the making of the unjust statement that I am "a most indifferent teacher," that concerns me.

19875. This came as a great surprise to you?—It came as a great surprise indeed.

19876. What was the salary you had in 1900, or for the three years previous to 1900?—I could not really say, but £115 was the average of the three previous years.

19877. Mr. HENRY.—Is not that increased since?—Yes, by the capitation grant.

19878. Mr. HENRY.—You had £116 for the previous three years?—Yes.

19879. That was higher than the maximum of second grade, and then you must have been placed in the second division of first grade. In reference to that, the teachers all over the country were complaining for a long time after 1900 that they did not know their grade?—That is so.

The CHAIRMAN.—But it appears that this gentleman does not know his grade in 1913.

19880. Mr. HENRY.—Have you got increments?—I never got increments. The average of the school did not entitle me to an increment.

19881. What was your average?—About 45.

19882. Then you must have been what is known as an intergrade, coming at the top of the second grade, and not a salary equivalent to the second of first?—Yes.

19883. And, therefore, not eligible for increment unless you got promotion?—Yes.

19884. And you could not get promotion unless you had an average of 50?—Yes, that is it.

19885. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, you say the school referred to as G. on page 200 is your school?—Yes.

19886. It is well there that it is "In charge of a first-class teacher"?—That was a mistake to say that I got promotion to first of first on a number of years of highly efficient service. I had two years of highly efficient service. The manager communicated with the Board, and there was a communication to him, saying that they held it over for consideration, whether they would promote me or give me four years of highly efficient service, pending the report of the fourth year. The letter was—"Rev. Sir,—With reference to the communication recently received from the principal teacher of the above-named school, I am directed to inform you that the consideration of Mr. O'Grady's claim to be graded on highly efficient service for the year ending 31st March, 1900, is held over until next year."

19887. Mr. HENRY.—The meaning of that is, that a short time before 1900 there were a number of teachers doing very good work through the country who were not able to pass examination so as to get promotion.

in the higher classes. Then the Board made a regulation that any teacher giving seven years highly efficient service was eligible for promotion to first class?—That is it.

19088. The Rector or Rector.—Your point is that you got promotion by examination and not by efficient service?—Yes.

19089. So that the statement made in the Tipperary Teachers' Memorial about you was incorrect?—It was not correct.

19090. The Chairman.—You did not see this before it was published?—No, sir, I did not.

19091. You got eight "good" reports from different inspectors down to June, 1910. Is that so?—Yes.

19092. The last being given in 1910?—Yes, in June, 1910, the 6th of June.

19093. In October of that year Mr. Welpy reduced the mark?—Yes, the 6th of October of that year.

19094. They say—"In October, after the summer vacation, Mr. Welpy reduces the mark to 'fair,' on a very damaging report, virtually charging the teacher with being a fraud"?—Yes, sir.

19095. Have you got that report?—Yes, sir. (Witness hands in report.)

19096. Mr. KERR.—This is the report:—"16th November, 1910. Mr. Welpy, Senior Inspector. Fair. This school looks better than it really is. As an inspector's visit the principal makes a great display of energetic teaching, but I regret to find, on testing his work, that the pupils' knowledge is far from commensurate with what one might be disposed to expect from them. I trust, therefore, that Mr. O'Grady will abandon mere show in favour of faithful performance of duty. Reading is much too quick, and it is devoid of taste and expression. Grammar is almost unknown, and composition is generally very backward in third and fourth standards. The progress in singing is very inadequate. Arithmetic was badly known in fifth and sixth standards, and no lessons have been given in health and habits since last winter. An exact is required. Discipline and order might be improved with much advantage to the school. The playground should be gravelled. The boys' offices should be scrubbed. There is a broken slate on the roof of the school, and one pane of glass is broken. There is no map of the British Islands in the school"?—That is the report.

19097. Who was your inspector the previous year?—Mr. Franklin examined in June, 1910.

19098. The Chairman.—He was a junior inspector, was he not—a junior inspector unattached?—I think so.

19099. Mr. KERR.—This is the report:—"Inspection 6th of June, 1910. Merit mark, 'good.' Inspector, Mr. Franklin. The organisation of the school is weak, and in consequence much time is wasted. In spite, however, of this the principal does useful work. He should give more attention to the teaching of handwriting and the revision of the written work generally. The junior assistant mistress's preparation for work is practically worthless. There is consequently little method or connected order in her teaching. The floor of the school is very dirty. Quantities of mud seem to be brought in on the boots of the children. Coping is off boundary wall in several places. Playground should be gravelled." Here is another:—"Date of inspection, 31st of March, 1909. Inspector, Mr. McNary. Merit mark, 'good.' The teaching generally is systematic and intelligent, and the pupils are making good progress in their studies. There has been some improvement in reading, spelling, and drawing, except in a few instances. Penmanship, too, reaches a good standard of merit. Needlework and arithmetic are very successfully taught. Some of the coping stones have been pulled off the boundary wall. An additional press is needed"?—Yes.

19100. The Chairman.—You reply to those criticisms on page 236 of that appendix which you have before you. You see the passage there about Temperance National School?—Yes, I have page 236 before me.

19101. Do you see the passage about Temperance School there?—Yes.

19102. That is your reply to those criticisms?—Yes, sir.

19103. Now, how long did Mr. Welpy spend in the inspection?—He reached the school at 25 minutes past 9 that morning. We both arrived at the school together. Well, of course, the children were coming in up to 10, and at about 10 minutes to 10 I was getting ready my class in geometry.

19104. You say here "Teaching measurement"?—Yes, geometry and measurement.

19105. "And Mr. Welpy told me to get ready for the general inspection"?—Quite so.

19106. Did you expect that general inspection?—Not by any means.

19107. How long before had you had an inspection?—On the 6th of June previous.

19108. And this was the 6th of October?—The school was four weeks in operation after the summer holidays.

19109. The general inspection in June had been held by Mr. Franklin. Did Mr. Welpy come and listen to your giving a lesson then?—Not by any means then.

19110. How did he reach this conclusion, "I regret to find, on testing the work, that the pupils' knowledge is far from commensurate with what one might be disposed to expect from them"?—I really could not say how he could arrive at that conclusion except by examining the classes.

19111. Did he examine?—He examined a class at 10 o'clock with a view to inspection.

19112. Mr. KERR.—On what programme?—I could not say what programme he took. As well as my memory serves me, he did not ask for the progress book. That is as well as my memory serves me.

19113. The Chairman.—You are not sure?—I don't want to commit myself, but my impression is that he did not ask for it.

19114. Did he go beyond the programme in the examination?—Well, I could not really say that.

19115. Mr. KERR.—You had only seven weeks' work?—I had only four weeks' work.

19116. The Chairman.—What is the meaning of his saying that he did not find you in faithful discharge of duty?—He appears to contradict himself there. He says he found me very energetic, and I don't know how the two statements could be reconciled.

19117. He states that you became more energetic in consequence of that visit?—I was working just as hard as I always do, and that is hard enough, and he was really present before I knew he was there at all.

19118. What have you to say to the criticism that grammar was almost unknown in your school?—Well, that could not be possible. I don't see how he could arrive at that conclusion.

19119. You seem to allege that this examination took place when the school had only been working a few weeks?—Yes, sir.

19120. After the vacation?—Yes, sir.

19121. And then you object to Mr. Welpy's style of examination?—Yes, sir.

19122. Did he not examine in accordance with the programme or the Notes for Teachers?—Well, I did not like his manner towards the pupils. I will give you an instance of it, or a few instances of it. He pointed out weak sentences in different books, and handed them to the children, and he said, "Look over that, analyse that." Now, of course, a child (we were all children) would be a bit nervous at first.

19123. Mr. KERR.—The first thing is—"This school makes a much better impression on inspection than on examination, and I find in testing the standards very considerable weakness. It is remarked that only three months of the school year had passed, and of these five weeks were given for vacation; yet the pupils cannot have forgotten all their analysis, for example, in that time"?—He says it makes a much better impression on inspection than on examination.

19124. You have told us about the grammar and analysis. Then as to the composition of third and fourth standards, what does he say about that?—He says—"Composition is very backward in third and fourth standards." Now, what composition, or what style of composition, could be expected from the third standard that was only promoted on the last of July, and six weeks' vacation then to intervene (and the school had been open for only four weeks)?

25th July, 1935.]

Mr. MICHAEL O'GRADY examined.

[Continued.]

19925. Mr. COFFEY.—And they were not doing any composition to the second standard?—Well, of course, the forming of sentences.

19926. Writing on paper?—Yes.

19927. The CHAIRMAN.—They do a little composition in the second standard?—Yes.

19928. They ought to have some knowledge of composition, I suppose, in the third?—Well, to my mind, they had as much composition as could reasonably be expected from children in the third standard.

19929. Your point is that he expected too much from them?—That is my point.

19930. Now, we go on to the next statement, that progress in singing is very inadequate. Who taught the singing in your school?—I did, sir.

19931. He insisted on the junior standard singing by themselves. Is that according to the directions of the Board (he says it is)?—Well, the Board sent round their organiser a good many years previously, Miss Colebough, a most capable lady in that branch. She has been, I believe, four times in my school. She saw all the children that were able to sing put together, and she approved of it, and that is the way I always taught it, and I could not see how I could improve on it, and I cannot see, because there is no class-room there in the school.

19932. Mr. WELBY says—"Mr. O'Grady said that an organiser told him to have his pupils together for singing, and I should like to know what organiser told him. It is too plain"—I have just given you the name, Miss Colebough.

19933. Did he speak to you about this matter when he was examining?—Yes, he told me to take the juniors by themselves at singing. I said I could not do that, that I took all the children together, and he would not have it.

19934. Did you give him the authority of the organiser for that?—I did not, sir.

19935. Then we go on to arithmetic being badly known in the fifth and sixth standards. What does he say about that in his reply?—I will just give you quotations from some of the inspectors here with your permission, about arithmetic in my school. These are extracts from the report of Mr. Benson. Mr. Benson in 1905 says—"Arithmetic has been very well taught."

19936. Mr. KERRIN.—This is Mr. Benson's report of 1905:—"Satisfactory work on the whole has been done in the school during the past year. Considerable improvement has been effected in oral English, while arithmetic has been very well taught." Is that what you want?—Yes, thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN.—Is there any report nearer to 1930 that speaks of arithmetic?

19937. Mr. KERRIN.—There is Mr. McEnery's report of the 3rd of March, 1930, in which he says—"Needle-work and arithmetic are very successfully taught"—Yes, that is in 1930.

19938. The CHAIRMAN.—Yes, that is to the point. That is your answer to the criticism. You say, "As a matter of fact there was only one child present in the fifth standard, and she not only very irregular in attending school, but a very dull child"—Yes, Mr. WELBY found fault with the discipline because a little boy of 34 years old was naturally somewhat restless.

19939. Mr. COFFEY.—How many children are there in the fifth?—I have only four.

19940. Mr. HICKY.—How many assistants?—Only a junior assistant mistress.

19941. The CHAIRMAN.—You go on to describe his manner to the children, and you say he gave way to anger?—He did undoubtedly. He was sitting on a chair the same as I am sitting, and he had the class round him, the senior standard, at reading. One of the children, of course, as we all would probably try to do in years gone by, tried to find out the meaning of a word at the end of the book and Mr. WELBY rebuked him. The child tried it a second time, and he almost jumped off the chair and threatened the child that if he did it again he would put him outside the door.

19942. And then you allege that his manner towards your junior assistant mistress was rude?—Yes,

and that was at the very start of the inspection that morning. He told her to write some words on the blackboard for the juniors to copy, and she wrote them. This girl is very nervous at inspections, so that when an inspector comes into the school, or anyone is speaking to her, she turns as white as chalk. She wrote the words on the board, the children, instead of copying the words as they were, not only copied them, but formed sentences from them, which when he saw he fared up at the assistant. I never saw anything like it, saying—"Well, while I am an inspector I never saw such a misunderstanding with a teacher before."

19943. Mr. COFFEY.—Did he say that loud enough to have the pupils hear it?—Yes.

19944. The CHAIRMAN.—You say it was a subject of conversation?—Quite so. Subsequently, when the parents were speaking about the junior assistant mistress, of course it went about, and they talked of the domineering of Mr. WELBY in the school, and when the parents were speaking to my assistant about Mr. WELBY they simply said—"How could the children be expected to answer the inspector when he treated you as he did in their presence?"

19945. Now, the last thing you say is that the examination was in the results system style?—Quite so.

19946. Just as it was before 1900?—He went into every subject.

19947. And examined every child?—Every child in the school; he did not pass over one; and the very infants that were not able to recognise their letters—be brought them up.

19948. And did he mark them?—Well, he marked them in his notebook.

19949. Mr. KERRIN.—There is another extract from one of these reports that might be put in. It is an extract from a subsequent report of Mr. P. J. McGeeney. Mr. McGeeney inspected on the 16th of October, 1912, and gave the merit mark "fair," and in his report he says—"The principal's methods of teaching are good, but the material on which he had to work on the day of inspection was below the average, and did not repay him for the trouble taken"—Yes.

19950. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—I think it would be just as well to have the marks from 1905 taken down in succession. On the 12th of January, 1908, Mr. McEnery inspected and gave the mark "good," and he said—"The school is worked on right lines, but more practice at oral composition is required in the case of third and higher standards. On the 27th of January, 1908, Mr. J. O'Riordan gave the mark "good" and said—"The general proficiency of the pupils was good; order and discipline are well maintained"; and he refers to some things which might be included. On the 4th of February, 1904, Mr. Benson marked the school "fair," and says—"The internal equipment and furniture needed re-printing. The style of reading needs improvement. Oral composition requires more attention. At present even the senior pupils do not express themselves correctly. Periodical examinations should be held by the teacher, and a record of the results should be kept." In 1905 Mr. Benson marks "good," and says—"Satisfactory work has on the whole been done in this school during the past year." On the 24th of February, 1906, Mr. Benson marks the school "good," and says—"The teacher's work is characterized by intelligence, and, on the whole, the condition of the school is good." On the 3rd of May, 1907, Mr. McEnery gives the mark "good," and he says—"The teacher appears to attend carefully to the general training of the pupils, and a good standard of proficiency has been reached in most branches of instruction." On the 11th of June, 1908, Mr. McEnery gave the mark "good," and he says—"Having regard to the fact that the school was closed during last weeks, owing to a bad epidemic of measles and influenza, the progress made by the pupils since last general inspection was generally good." On the 25th of April, 1909, Mr. McEnery again gave the school "good," and he says—"The teaching generally is systematic and intelligent, and the pupils are making good progress in their studies." Mr. Franklin, on the 6th of June, 1910, gives the school "good," and says—

25th July, 1913.]

Mr. MICHAEL O'GRADY examined.

[Continued.]

"The organisation of the school is weak, and in consequence much time is wasted. In spite, however, of this, the principal did useful work"; and he mentions some things which might be improved; he mentions the dirt on the floor, which has been already referred to. On the 16th of November, 1910, Mr. Weply marked the school "fair," and I think we have had an report in full; and on the 17th of November, 1911, Mr. F. J. Fitzgerald marks the school "fair," but he says—"The school has improved since last general inspection, but it cannot be described as 'good' until the method of teaching and English and proficiency in this branch are improved still further." And on the 10th of October, 1912, Mr. Fitzgerald gives the mark "fair," and says—"The principal's methods of teaching are good, but the material on which he had to work on the day of inspection was below the average, and did not pay him for the trouble he took. The junior assistant mistakes does fair work." That completes the series, so that you had "good" down till Mr. Weply marked your school "fair"?—Yes.

19953. The *Biscuit or Bess*.—Now, of course, this Blue Book of oars is in the hands of the public?—Yes, my lord.

19952. And there is a statement that I really think we cannot let go abroad without hearing your explanation. The statement is made that you keep a publichouse in the town of Cashel?—Yes.

19955. And then it is stated in another part that the house is kept in your wife's name?—Yes, that was the fact, my lord, at the time.

19954. Have you any longer any pecuniary interest in that?—None whatsoever, my lord.

19955. Or your wife's?—Or my wife.

19956. So that you are completely rid of it?—Yes. May I speak a little on that role.

19957. Yes?—My wife's mother had a publichouse in the town of Thurles. Well, my wife was her eldest daughter, and at the time I married her (for I was living near Thurles) she had made over the house to my wife. There was no rule of the Board at that time to prohibit that.

19958. Mr. Bessie—What year was that?—February, 1897. In the year 1890 my mother-in-law sold out her property in Thurles, and with the money she received for it my wife purchased the house she held in Cashel. There was nothing to prohibit it. There was no rule to prohibit that. There were many teachers through the country whose wives had publichouses. In the year 1906 this matter about the house came under the observation of a certain inspector, and he spoke to me about it, and I must say he very kindly made a certain suggestion to me. He said to me—"Can't you get a partition or a division in your house, and get a separate valuation, and you are safe?" I did not do it, and, of course, in view of the rule that was enacted in 1907, if I had 40 divisions, it would be useless. In 1911, on the 31st of January or 1st of February, Mr. Weply came into the house. He told me that he wanted me outside. "I suppose you know what I want you for?" "Indeed I do, Mr. Weply." "What are you going to do?" "Well," I said, "I must get time to think over the matter." "By the way," I said to him, "might I ask you are you doing this off your own bat, or was I reported?" He hesitated before he answered, and he answered in reply, "I think you were reported." We went on walking a further distance, about half a mile or thereabouts, talking about the matter, and I again asked him was it reported I was, and he said that he thought it was, that he had a communication in his pocket for two months instructing him to find out where I was living. He asked me what I was going to do, and I said I should get time. I wrote to him stating the fact, and in about three weeks or a month thereafter a communication came down from the Board to my manager, the late Dean Kinane, inquiring about the publichouse. The thing was left in abeyance for a while. The quarterly payment fell due in April, and I got no salary, and a further communication came from the Board to send my statement of the facts, and I sent it, stating the pure facts as they really were,

and that this house was taken when there was no rule prohibiting it; the correspondence went on for a considerable time. In the end, about twelve months afterwards, the house had to be sold, and I was kept for twelve months without salary. In the meantime I looked the matter up, and a teacher informed me that a question had been put in the House of Commons and that the answer to that question led him to think that vested rights would be respected. The question was put on the 2nd of July, 1908, and this is the reply from the Chief Secretary, that he was assured by the Commissioners that their rule has not really had any retrospective effect. That was the reply on the 2nd of July, 1908. During my tenure with the Commissioners over the transaction, trying to have vested rights respected, this question was put by Mr. Haskett, M.P., in the House of Commons on the 10th of August, 1911.—"To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Commissioners of National Education have withheld the salary of Michael O'Grady, teacher of Templemore National School, Cashel, Co. Tipperary, on the ground that his wife is owner of a publichouse contrary to Rule 88 (a); whether he is aware that the publichouse in question was purchased by Mr. O'Grady's mother-in-law, who sold out a business house in Thurles in order to purchase the house in Cashel for her daughter, and that Rule 88 (a) came into force seven years after, namely, in 1907; and whether, seeing that the Commissioners have stated that their new rule, making the rule made in 1907, has not really had any retrospective effect, and that Mr. O'Grady is now living in a private residence apart from the publichouse, and is in no way connected with the business carried on by his wife, he will make representations to the Commissioners with a view to having Mr. O'Grady restored to his former status, and permit him to continue to remain in charge of his school?" That was the question. This is Mr. Birrell's reply.—"The Commissioners of National Education, to whom I have referred this question, informed me that the facts are as stated in the first two paragraphs of the question, but that it is not correct to say that Rule 88 (a) only came into force in 1907. It had been the practice for some years previously to enforce this provision, and the addition made to the rule in 1907 was for the purpose of bringing it into conformity with the practice of the Commissioners. I cannot undertake to make any representations to the Commissioners with regard to the case." Now, that appears to be an improvement on Mr. Birrell's reply of the 2nd of July, 1908, when he said that vested rights were not interfered with. In his reply of the 10th of August, 1911, he states that it was the practice to enforce this provision for a number of years, but how did I know what the practice was? Even that inspector who made the suggestion that I mentioned to me did not know what the practice of the Board was for a number of years previously.

19959. The *Biscuit or Bess*.—Would it not appear that the Inspector wished to suggest to you a means by which you could evade the practice of the Board, or the rule of the Board, by dividing the house into two distinct parts and getting two distinct valuations, so that you would have then two houses instead of one?—Well, my lord, I do not think the same inspector would countenance any evasion of the Board's rule. Mr. Weply says in the wind-up, in the last two lines of his reply to me (I have to go into the publichouse question here again)—"I think the motive of Mr. O'Grady's belated complaints about my inspection is fairly evident." Now, gentlemen, as a matter of fact, I was the first teacher that came into the open and found fault with Mr. Weply. That was in December, 1910. I was the very first teacher who came out against Mr. Weply at the County Meeting in Thurles.

19960. Let us finish the publichouse question. The statement that you have made to us seems altogether to be founded on the technicalities of the matter, whether there was a rule against this or not against it, but, apart altogether from the rule of the Board, I want to ask you are you prepared to admit that there is some moral incongruity in the teacher of a school, who has the formation of the character and habits of the children, being either a publican himself

on having an interest in a publichouse, if there was never a rule of the Board?—Well, my lord, I simply stand by the vested rights.

19061. You come up here, representing not merely yourself, but representing the body of teachers, and I want an answer from you on that?—Well, I am not prepared to deal with that aspect of the question at all, my lord.

19062. You see not?—No.

19063. Well, suppose I put it on the ground of the inconsistency and not of the wrong example set would you differ?—Well, I don't know that it is a bad example. I know publicans whose sons have been ornaments of the Church.

19064. Did they keep publichouses?—They were bred, born and reared in publichouses.

19065. But that does not at all settle the question of whether a person who is set up as an example to his children should be a publican himself?—It does not necessarily follow.

19066. In any case, you do not wish to express any opinion on the question?—On that new rule—No, my lord, I do not.

19067. And you stand by it that where there are vested rights?—They should be respected, as in the case of the maternity rule. In that case vested rights were, after a great fight, respected.

19068. You see that in dealing with the question of a publichouse we are dealing with a much wider question than that of the maternity rule; we are dealing with the future of the country, which is a very different question?—It is a question of vested rights, my lord.

19069. The CHAIRMAN.—Now you may go on to Mr. Welply's remarks, as you were about to do?—Yes. Mr. Welply says, in reply to my letter, "I think the motive of Mr. O'Grady's belated complaints about my inspection is fairly evident," meaning thereby that because he reported me about the publichouse I sent in the belated complaints. As a matter of fact, I was the very first teacher who came into the open and complained about the style of his examination.

19070. Where did you do that?—At the county meeting on Thurles, three years this December.

19071. Mr. KETTEL.—Your point is that it is an absolutely unfounded and unjustifiable insinuation?—Yes, quite so.

19072. And whatever you may have felt for the loss of the publichouse, you thought you had good grounds for complaining that injustice had been done in the marking of your school; and that you made the complaint on that ground, and only on that ground?—Quite so; that the publichouse aspect of the question had nothing at all to do with it.

19073. And it seems to have nothing to do with the marking of your school, and it seems to be quite irregularly introduced by Mr. Welply in defence of his own action?—Yes.

Mr. MICHAEL O'FLANNAGAN, Principal of Killeenavoe

19086. The CHAIRMAN.—How long have you been principal of Killeenavoe School, Mr. O'Flanagan?—Since March, 1905.

19087. Were you principal of a school before that?—Yes, for 11 months.

19088. Where?—In Ballina, in the West of Ireland.

19089. Was that your first appointment as principal?—Yes.

19090. And before that you were assistant in some school?—An assistant in Westmeath.

19091. And when did you enter the service of the Board first?—The 1st of September, 1900.

19092. Now, what is your present grade under the National Board?—Second grade.

19093. And you have served 12 years and 9 months?—Yes.

19094. And you were trained at St. Patrick's College, from 1895 to 1900?—Yes.

19095. And you got your training diploma in September, 1903?—Yes.

19074. Before the date of this inspection, did you receive from the National Board any communication with regard to your breach of the Board's rule in keeping a publichouse?—Not at all, not by any means.

19075. After that inspection you did receive a communication?—I did. The inspection was on October 6th.

19076. What was the date of the conversation with Mr. Welply?—The 31st of January, 1913, or the 1st of February.

19077. What was the date of the memorial?—The first steps taken about the memorial were taken at the December meeting, in 1910. That was a couple of months after his inspection of my school.

19078. I should like you to understand at this stage that I agree altogether with the Lord Bishop with regard to this question of your being proprietor of a publichouse?—All right.

19079. But, at any rate, those were the dates. The inspection was in October, 1910?—Yes.

19080. And the memorial in December?—No; I did not say the memorial in December, but that steps were taken about it.

19081. And the visit of Mr. Welply, on which he wrote to the Board about your keeping a publichouse, was on the 31st of January, 1913?—He visited me on either of those two days, the 31st of January or 1st of February. The weather became bad, and I attended the school for a couple of days, and I lost my voice. I was home for a fortnight with a bad attack of influenza, and I did not communicate for a fortnight's time with Mr. Welply, and in the course of another fortnight a communication came down from the Board to the manager about the publichouse. That would be sometime about the end of February.

19082. There is another point. Your evidence is that the fact that you or your wife were keeping a publichouse was known to an inspector of the Board from 1906?—Yes.

19083. You are quite positive about that?—Yes, I am quite certain.

19084. You are quite positive that an inspector of the Board was aware of the fact that you or your wife were keeping a publichouse?—Yes.

19085. To guard against a possible misconception, while I take a strong view about Mr. Welply introducing the publichouse here in this memorandum at that particular time, and while I have some sympathy with your vested rights claim, Mr. O'Grady, I may say that I think it would be quite proper for Mr. Welply to report the fact that you had a publichouse in the first instance to the Board. It was a different thing to introduce it afterwards, when the trouble arose?—Yes.

Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—We all agree with his lordship that it is highly inexpedient that any National School teacher, either by himself or his wife, should hold a publichouse.

National School, County Tipperary, examined.

19096. And the Board's certificate for Irish in July, 1904?—Yes.

19097. And a qualification to teach elementary science under the Board and a certificate from the Department of Agriculture?—Yes.

19098. And then you got promotion to second grade on the 1st of April, 1909?—Yes.

19099. Now, you say that for the consideration of the Committee you give a full account of the reports of inspectors, &c., since your appointment to Killeenavoe School. Will you read what you have to put before us?—Mr. Bannan visited my school on the 1st of October, 1905. I was there five months then, and he gave me the report "good," and his minute was, "Very satisfactory progress has been made in the school since the present principal was appointed." On the 14th of November, 1906, Mr. W. A. Brown inspected my school, and he gave the report "very good," and the minute he made was, "This school is

22th July, 1913.]

MR. MICHAEL O'FLANAGAN examined.

[Continued.]

very well conducted. All standards taught by principal succeeded exceptionally well under examination, and their instruction during the year has been systematic and intelligent. The assistant does her work carefully." Then, on the 6th of December, 1907, the inspector was Mr. J. Yates, the head inspector being Mr. W. A. Brown, and he gave me "very good," and he wrote: "This school continues in a very satisfactory condition, and teachers deserve much credit." In 1908 Mr. Yates also gave the report "very good" (Mr. Brown being the head inspector), and in the same he wrote, "Very skilful and effective work is done in this school, and general proficiency is very creditable." In 1909 Mr. Yates again inspected (I am not quite sure who was the head inspector that year for our district, whether Mr. Brown or Mr. Welpy), and he gave the report "very good," and wrote, "The condition of this school continues 'very good,' and pupils are intelligently trained." In 1911 (that is the examination for the year 1910), Mr. Yates (the head inspector being Mr. W. H. Welpy) gave the report "good," and wrote, "This is a very useful school, well kept, and systematically taught. Senior standards creditable; juniors fair."

20000. Have you got that report of Mr. Welpy's with you?—No; Mr. Welpy did not examine my school.

20001. But you have got his report?—I have the report in the Observation Book, but I did not bring it with me. I did not bring any official documents from the school.

20002. The BRANCH or BOSS.—You have the report in full, Mr. Yates's report?—The report for 1911, "Annual inspection. Reading, infants fair; second class, good; 2nd and 4th, fair; 5th to 8th, good. Writing, junior, good; seniors, very good. Arithmetic, 1st and 2nd standards, mechanical work very fair; 5th to 8th standards, good. Geography, 5th to 8th, good. History, 5th to 7th, fair. Drawing, seniors, fair. Needlework, good. Object lesson, 1st and 2nd, good. Elementary Science. Note-books well kept. The room is well kept and warmed. J. Yates, D.I." Of course, there was something about the premises that I did not copy into that; I only wrote in about the school work. What he said about the building I did not put into this as I thought it had nothing to do with me.

20003. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Go on to the next inspection, 18th of December, 1911—that was conducted by Mr. Yates also?—Yes.

20004. And then your mark was reduced to "fair"?—Yes.

20005. Read the report?—This was the annual inspection. He was there two days. The first day he came there were only 18 in school; it was a very wet day.

20006. The CHAIRMAN.—What is your average attendance?—I expect my average attendance that year will be 66.

20007. What number were present that day?—Eighteen the first day. The following are Mr. Yates's remarks in the Observation Book on this day:—"Very wet day; 18 present, one late. Floor should be much cleaner. Table needs revision. Dull lessons are to be criticised. I would strongly recommend a few minutes about 1.30 and morning inspection as to cleanliness and neatness. Preparation of principal's notes good. Assistant's not of much use. Arithmetic was well taught to seniors, fairly to juniors. Juniors still hold pens badly. Senior writing good. Knitting and darning fair. Reading—Story books should be used firstly to foster an interest in reading. J. Yates." Then on the morning of the 15th he came in again and he reported that day more or less upon the plan of work. "Reading, infants' conversation middling, first, good; second, fair; 5th to 7th, fair. Writing, generally good, but holding pen still needs attention. Arithmetic, juniors, fair. Geography, 5th to 7th, fair. History, 5th to 7th, good. Elementary Science, Note-books are well written, but children show very little knowledge of the recent experiments given. Do not confuse weight and volume. Progress Book should record the work of all

standards. No Christmas celebration has been held. More periodical examination would be useful. Floor is better swept to-day. J. Yates, D.I."

20008. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—What have you been reading from now?—The reports in the observation book.

20009. The CHAIRMAN.—You quote him as saying in the report, "The condition of this school is not as good as formerly. In the senior division reading needs considerable improvement and science is very poor. Infant training is very defective, and general organisation needs improvement." Now we come to the inspection of the 28th of September, 1912?—Yes, this is the instance.—The school staff has been strengthened by the appointment of a new assistant. The work is carried on with much life and vigour, and the efficiency seems likely to rise to its former high level."

20010. That inspection was by Mr. Mahon?—Yes.

20011. He restored your mark "good"?—Yes.

20012. He says the school has been strengthened by the appointment of a new assistant and the work is carried on with much life and vigour. When was that assistant appointed?—The 1st of July, and there were five weeks' holidays then to be taken out of that.

20013. And he attributes the improvement to the appointment of an assistant?—Oh, he could not do that.

20014. The appointment would not produce that effect?—It could not; so much improvement could not be effected in seven weeks.

20015. Had you Mr. Welpy examining the school at all?—No, never, only incidentally.

20016. Have you anything to say about his visit to the school?—Nothing, only he was there at nine o'clock. Mr. Welpy paid an incidental visit to this school on 16th September, 1910, from 9 o'clock to 10.40 and made the following report on the work of the school in the observation book:—"The written work is very good. Drawing shows progress. Many pupils come in early, and most of them are tidy and neat. On the whole, this school makes a distinctly favourable impression."

20017. That is his last?—Yes.

20018. What is the date of that?—16th of September, 1910.

20019. Now you have something to say about an inspection later, after Mr. Welpy's visit?—Yes, Mr. Yates held the annual inspection and lowered his own mark from "very good" to "good." Looking over the reports and minutes, you will see that I have not been reprimanded for a single thing, nor is there a single subject mentioned as being neglected, with the exception of the 1911 report. In this everything is wrong. Reading in Senior Division, it says, needs considerable improvement. Well, in 1909 I got "very good" for reading for the same pupils in the same group. Infant organisation was the same as when I got "special promotion." The examination was held on two days, 13th and 15th December, both very wet days. I will set out in a short table number on rolls, number present, number made over 100 days during previous 12 months, and average for quarter in which these days occur:—

	On Rolls.	Present.	Made over 100 days.
Junior Division.	44	19	12½ 16th
Senior Division.	36	17	13½ Dec.
			Average for Quarter, 55.4
Junior Division.	44	4	2½ 13th
Senior Division.	36	18	16½ Dec.

On the 1911 Report depended my increment, and it is hardly conceivable that I would allow the presidency of my school to drop to "fair." The previous Report was lowered to "good," and I knew that unless I got "good" in the 1911 Report that my increment was lost and that my successful career

as a teacher was interfered with more or less. Now, judging from the marks awarded to my school in 1910-1911 I should say the standard of marking was raised between 30 and 50 per cent. in this district. Second—Considering the attendance on 15th and 16th December, 1911, the merit mark of my school should not have been lowered even though the answering of children fell far below the average. Third—On day of annual inspection the answering of pupils who have not been present at least 100 days in previous twelve months should not be taken into account when awarding the "merit mark" of the school. Fourth—A teacher should get some notification of the annual inspection. I may mention that since a Catechist was appointed in the Diocese of Killaloe I have received seven reports on the proficiency of pupils in Christian Doctrine. Marks received were either "very good" or "excellent," the majority being "excellent."

20020. Mr. KETTLE.—The last point you make is that the teacher should get some notice of the annual inspection. Would you develop that point?—I will state my reasons. At present an inspector may come on a wet day or at a busy time of the year when there is a small attendance. Had they previous notice of his visit the teachers would make an effort to have every pupil present. This would give the teacher a chance of having his good pupils in attendance as well as the dull ones.

20021. Tell me what you think would be fair notice?—A week, at least. At present when an inspector comes, he may come on a wet day, or on a busy time of the year, and if pupils knew that he was coming on a certain day you might have all your pupils in. He might come on a day when there would be a lot of bad pupils in.

20021a. He might come on a day when there was a low attendance, and the attendance might not be a good sample of the school?—Yes, and that happened in my case.

20022. What length of notice should the teacher get?—I am sure the teachers would be satisfied with a week's notice.

20023. One week?—At least a week. We never get notice now.

20024. Do you think the manager should be given an opportunity of being present at the inspection?—It would be very useful. At present the manager gets notice on the morning of the inspection, but the manager may live 8 or 10 miles away.

20025. The CHAIRMAN.—Has your manager generally been present?—Never.

20026. Mr. KETTLE.—In this Clonsilla circuit there are two possible hypotheses—either the previous inspector was very easy going and the level of education had rather declined, or Mr. Welby was too harsh. The opinion of Mr. Hynde on it is expressed in these words:—"Before he took charge of the Tipperary circuit there was, I fear, a great deal of unflattering praise on the part of inspectors." Is that your experience?—No.

20027. He goes on to give a sort of concrete evidence in favour of that:—"That this easy going style of inspection extended to the checking of accounts as well as to the testing of proficiency, seems probable from the fact that, during the two years prior to Mr. Welby's appointment, not a single teacher in the circuit was fined for falsification, whereas, in the two subsequent years, fines were imposed for this kind of offence in not less than ten cases."—I had Mr. Yates for six years and found him most painstaking in checking accounts. He generally spent an hour and a half at Annual Inspections at the accounts.

20028. Is it your knowledge that nobody was fined?—I never heard of anyone. Taking my own school as a standard, I should say that education has declined in the Clonsilla circuit within the past couple of years. I had to cease teaching mathematics to seniors.

20029. The CHAIRMAN.—Why?—Simply because I could not afford time. I had to work from 9 till 4 every day to keep up to the standard that is wanting now.

20030. Mr. KETTLE.—Algebra is an extra?—Yes, I was teaching it as an extra then.

20031. Have you any complaint to make regarding his manner?—Mr. Welby did not speak to me near I to him, from the time he came in till he went out. In fact I hardly knew who he was till I went to the observation book when he had gone.

20032. The CHAIRMAN.—You had not seen him before?—I had not.

20033. Did he not announce himself?—I think not, but I won't be sure.

20034. Mr. COFFEY.—You had no conversation with him?—No; I was very glad to see the observation he made about my work.

20035. Mr. KETTLE.—I suppose the Committee may take it as fairly established in evidence that the teachers in the Clonsilla circuit are not contented?—Oh, they are not.

20036. Mr. HENRY.—Now, Mr. O'Flanagan, with your record from 1903 to 1910 and with your succession of "goods" and "very goods" up to the time of Mr. Welby, was there any relaxation or falling away of your own part in the work?—Not at all; in fact I worked harder.

20037. Was that school well up to the mark "very good"?—Yes, I taught the same way, and worked from 9 till 4, and dropped the teaching of mathematics, so I had more time than for the other subjects.

20038. Tell us why you dropped the mathematics?—Simply because the time I was devoting to mathematics in the morning and evening I turned to teaching the ordinary subjects.

20039. Do you think that the pupils that would have been taught algebra were as well off under the new arrangement as if they were getting instruction in mathematics?—I think not.

20040. That is that the new subjects to which you would have to give attention to a number of minute details were not an equivalent for what they had lost?—No. In 1910 I had two boys who got two scholarships in North Tipperary from the Department of Agriculture. One of those boys went to Ennis and the other to Roscrea.

20041. What were the subjects that you had to give increased attention to, so that you could not continue to teach mathematics?—The ordinary subjects of the school.

20042. The CHAIRMAN.—Reading, writing, and arithmetic?—Yes, and geography and grammar.

20043. Mr. COFFEY.—And drill?—Yes.

20044. Mr. HENRY.—And nature study?—We have complaints about nature study now; we had not so much then.

20045. Elementary science?—Yes.

20046. Mr. COFFEY.—Singing?—Yes.

20047. Mr. HENRY.—Drawing?—Drawing.

20048. Laundry?—Not at present.

20049. Do you think the programme is too crowded?—It is too crowded.

20050. What is the effect of that on the education of the pupils?—When pupils are promoted to 6th and 7th standards instead of confining them to ordinary subjects, more time should be given to advanced mathematics.

20051. Would the boys and girls attending your school be better or worse educated if their education was more concentrated than it is at present?—They would be better educated.

20052. Would they be better equipped for the battle of life afterwards?—They would.

12th July, 1913.]

Mr. MICHAEL O'FLANAGHAN examined.

[Continued.]

20053. Even if they were going to work with the scale I—I am sure they would. Of course you won't have anyone in 7th or 8th standards that will go to work with the scale.

20054. Would you be in favour of examination of your pupils or a system of inspection?—I prefer an examination.

20055. What did Mr. Welby give you?—Mr. Welby did not examine any.

20056. Well, Mr. Yates?—Examination generally, but my last examination was only inspection when I got that report "good." Mr. Yates always examined.

20057. They test by examination, and you require according to the rules of the Commissioners to prepare for inspection. Don't the Commissioners expect inspection in schools and not examination?—Yes.

20058. And, therefore, you have in purpose for inspection whilst at the same time you are subjected to examination?—Yes, I had an examination always up to September, 1913, when Mr. Mahon inspected.

20059. The *Banner of Ross*.—We were told here that Mr. Brown and Mr. McEnery only inspected?—Well, I have not any knowledge of Mr. McEnery, and I had only Mr. Brown once. This is the only thing of Mr. Brown's in my observation book. "This school is very well conducted, and intelligently taught by the principal. The tone and order are excellent."

20060. Did he examine on that occasion?—He examined in geography as far as I remember.

20061. But not in detail as Mr. Yates was in the habit of doing?—No; and I had Mr. Yates there for five or six years afterwards, and he always examined.

20062. Mr. HENRY.—Do you think the teachers should get notice of the examination or inspection, and should each school have its own school year as formerly?—It would be a very good thing.

20063. I am asking you your opinion?—Well, it would be a very good thing for each to have its own school year.

20064. And what would be the advantages of getting notice to the extent of one week?—One advantage is that you could inform all the children of the

inspector's visit and therefore be more likely to have them present.

20065. And would it tend to stimulate the attendance of the pupils?—Yes, and the parents also.

20066. You think it would be desirable to have the manager present?—I don't know that it would be any good, but the teachers would not object to it anyway.

20067. And what would be the advantage of having the manager present—supposing you had an unreasonable inspector, would it be an advantage to have the manager present?—It would, because a manager's presence might tend to make the inspector more reasonable.

20068. Do you think it would be desirable in the case of Mr. Welby?—I had only one incidental visit from Mr. Welby and cannot say much of his method of examination.

20069. Have you noticed any change in Mr. Yates' standard since Mr. Welby appeared on the scene?—He has become far more strict, but Mr. Yates' manner never changed, and he is most nice to teachers.

20070. To what do you attribute the change?—I think we might attribute it to Mr. Welby.

20071. I understood you to say that teachers of the circuit are positively discontented?—They are.

20072. For what cause?—The only cause is that a lot of the reports have been lowered.

20073. Have they anything else to complain of?—That I could not say. They have lost financially over the matter. Their standard has been pulled down.

20074. Did you lose financially?—Well, I did in this way. My income was delayed for thirteen months and my promotion delayed.

20075. The *Banner of Ross*.—Did it date back?—Yes, it dated back; but I cannot get special promotion now to first grade which I would be entitled to in 1915, were it not for lowering of marks made of school in 1910 and 1911.

20076. The CHAIRMAN.—And you cannot get it now?—I could not be promoted to first grade until 1915, were my school to keep up to its former high standard.

FORTY-THIRD DAY.—TUESDAY, JULY 29TH, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—Sir SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman); The Most Rev. DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross; Sir HIRSH SHAW WELKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN COFFEY; Mr. HENRAGE B. B. HARRISON, D.A.; Mr. JEREMIAH HENLY; Mr. WALTER MCMURROUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.; Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL KETTLER, D.L.; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Mr. T. KIRKIN, Principal, Rosagrove National School, Clonsilla, examined.

20077. The CHAIRMAN.—How long have you been principal of Rosagrove National School?—I have been principal of that school since 1894.

20078. And was that your first school?—No; I was principal of a school called Cloughrack, in the County Galway.

20079. For how many years?—Three years and three months.

20080. And before that?—I was a member of the special class in Marlborough Street, and I was a member of the general class previously; two years previous to that I was a pupil teacher in a model school, and three years before that I was a monitor in a school called Drumadara, in the County of Leitrim.

20081. And you have been 35 years in the service of the Board, I understand, or something like that?—

Yes; the number of years would amount to 39 at present.

20082. Then you have been in the service of the Board for over 35 years?—I have been 36. I obtained by examination the highest class under the Board, with special certificates in mechanics, magnetism and electricity, hydrostatics, hydraulics, pneumatics, agricultural chemistry; Science and Art certificates in advanced mathematics, magnetism and electricity, I am also qualified to teach tonic-rafts, school gardening, nature study, drill, etc.

20083. Now, you come to tell us a good deal about the origin of this trouble in the Clonsilla Circuit?—Yes, sir.

20084. And not so much about your own particular case?—Not so much; but in my capacity of Secretary to the County Tipperary Teachers' Association.

20085. I saw you were secretary to that body that sent in the memorial to the National Education Commissioners?—Yes.

20086. You acted as their secretary?—Yes.

20087. The letter to the Commissioners of National Education is in the blue book?—Yes.

20088. Then you have something to say about discontent amongst the teachers in District 18?—Yes. I have been in the district 30 years, and down to 1900 have not known any general or serious discontent with inspectors, although there was grave discontent with the system. No inspector for 25 years prior to 1900 left Clonsilla without a complimentary resolution passed by the teachers on his departure, and an equally complimentary reply from the inspector. When Mr. Welpy took charge in 1900 these happy relations ended. Discontent was smouldering for some time; and when a teacher, who felt deeply wronged, appealed to the Co. Association for protection, other cases rapidly followed. Hence the memorial of June, 1911, which is in page 203 of the Appendix to your Blue Book.

20089. Then you have something to say about Mr. Hynes?—Mr. Hynes severely criticises teachers for holding back complaints so long, and for acting in concert. No teacher, knowing Mr. Welpy, would be courageous, or perhaps foolhardy enough to act otherwise. In fact some of the worst cases of oppression never became public through fear, or were sent in and afterwards withdrawn, as can be proved.

20090. Do you know that of your knowledge?—Certainly.

20091. You know that men who had serious grievances would not sign your memorial?—Yes.

20092. Mr. Hynes inspected 15 selected schools (he has given the names, which are in our appendix), and you say only six of those schools were in the memorial. He raised the mark of four of them equal to 60 per cent., yet neither he nor the Board could conclude that the senior inspectors were correct or unjust. That is what you say in your press?—As a matter of fact there were 14 of those schools instead of 15. Then, I say, why were not 14 "memorial" schools inspected, and why were schools inspected when there was no complaint? Again Mr. Welpy says he knows that a deputation of teachers waited on whole loads of parish priests on Retreat at Thurles, to induce them to take part in charges against him, and that no manager could be induced to join the teachers (p. 214, Inquiry Appendix). The story about the deputation is absolutely groundless; no such deputation could be thought of during Retreat. But it is a fact that the Coshel Branch of the Munster Managers unanimously requested the Board to inquire into Mr. Welpy's conduct. He also states that advice tendered to the teachers is persistently disregarded, and that their teaching power to the promotion of new ideas is wonderful (77th Report, Commissioners of National Education). I have never known an organizer's class in Tipperary that was not well attended. I have known even married women teachers to travel 24 miles night after night in mid-winter to attend 7-11-12 Salfa classes in Clonsilla, and elderly teachers to leave the elements and ridicule in their efforts to learn singing and drill. So of other subjects.

20093. How could they do that?—They have done that. My wife has done it, and so did I.

20094. By train?—By car.

20095. They have gone 12 miles there and 12 miles back?—Yes, in mid-winter. The class terminated a couple of days before Christmas.

20096. And Mr. Keegan did that?—Mrs. Keegan did that night after night, and so did other married lady teachers.

20097. In mid-winter?—Yes, to attend this Salfa class in Clonsilla. Mr. Welpy, in support of his contention as to the backwardness of district 18, quotes five inspectors against Mr. Brown and Mr. McEnery at pages 214 and 260 in the Appendix to your Blue Book. Now, the average service of those five inspectors in 1911 was two years, while the average service of the two inspectors I have named was 24 years. The methods by which the two sets got into the service are different. Those two gentlemen got in

by open competition, but the others did not get in by open competition.

20098. And do you find fault with the present system of appointing inspectors?—Yes; I think the teachers would look up a great deal more to the inspectors who won their position by open competition than to inspectors appointed under the present system.

20099. Mr. COWLEY.—Who won their position by vote?—Yes.

20100. How do they get in chiefly now?—The present inspectors?

20101. Yes?—Well, the opinion is current that they got in very much by influence.

20102. With the Commissioners?—With the Commissioners, and competition would remove that idea.

20103. The Bazaar or Bazaar.—Do you regard the system of open competition as a good method of selecting inspectors?—That is, competition in literary subjects is a Civil Service Examination, such as occurred in the old times?—I believe it is a better system than the present one.

20104. What about training and experience in connection with National Education?—Earlier still those who succeeded in getting in by votes, very often who had no connection even as boys with a National school, they were brought up in a different atmosphere and they had no idea of the standard of education which might be required for National school boys and girls?—Yes.

20105. Was not that a difficulty?—Of course, it was. 20106. And don't you hold strongly by the fact that the inspectors should have some training or some experience in teaching?—Yes.

20107. The CHAIRMAN.—You would require an inspector to have been a teacher in some kind of school?—Yes, I think that should be one of the conditions.

20108. The Bazaar or Bazaar.—In the present mode of selection, we are informed that the Commissioners take very much into account the fact that those men have had some experience in teaching, others in primary schools, or in secondary schools, and that that element weighs very much with them?—But that element weighed, my Lord, under the old system also.

How could it weigh by open competition under the Civil Service?

The CHAIRMAN.—At any rate, in England and Scotland they have abandoned the system of examination, if they ever had it.

20109. Mr. HENLY.—Under the old system, Mr. Keegan, didn't you know of a number of inspectors who had been teachers?—Yes.

20110. Greer?—Yes.

20111. Molloy?—Yes.

20112. O'Riordan?—Quite right.

20113. And a number of others?—Yes, and a number of others; Mr. Lehanne, for instance.

20114. Those came from the ranks of the National teachers?—Yes, and under the system that was in operation then a large number of teachers of the highest ability and long and varied experience won their way to the inspectors. I might add that among the inspectors we have at the present time, Messrs. FitzGerald, Coyne, McElane, Little, were National teachers.

20115. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—You made the mistake of considering the system under which inspectors were previously appointed as that of open competition. Now there is open competition and there is limited competition, and there is the question of special qualification of those that are appointed. In some of the systems no person is appointed who has not, as a preliminary, those qualifications which would be specially required in his profession. In other cases, such as the Indian Civil Service, men are appointed by open competition, and they are required to qualify afterwards, and they get two years in order to qualify. Taking these things into consideration, would you approve of open competition?—Taking care that the subjects should be such as would be suitable.

20116. And that the qualification for teaching should be acquired afterwards?—I prefer to have that acquired before, and in a National school.

Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Then that necessitates a limited competition.

gets July, 1912.]

Mr. T. Kegan examined.

[Continued.]

20117. The CHAIRMAN.—Then you refer to Father Penbrooke's opinion?—Yes. When the discovery was made by Mr. Welby as to the backwardness of the Tipperary schools, Father Penbrooke's opinion was asked. He was then seven years President of Rockwell College, about the best secondary school in Ireland. He had been examining boys from all Ireland those seven years. He affirms that the education received in the primary schools of district 18 "is the best of his kind." In what field of activity was Tipperary over behind the rest of Ireland? And why should Tipperary schools be backward? It had even got the name of "pamper." But according to Mr. Welby that was all defect, so far as elementary education goes. Thirty-five per cent. of "v.g.'s" and "well-to-do" has been pulled down to 17 per cent. Now "now so poor to do it reverence." The County Executive Committee has come in for severe criticism as fomenters of strife, conspiracies, alarms, etc. A perusal of my letter (p. 216, Inquiry Appendix), will show the injustice of the criticism; also whether it was wise or otherwise for the Board to reject our advice and overture for peace. I may now add that were it not for the restraining influence of the County Executive, and the belief of the teachers in its power to get redress, there was grave reason to apprehend that it is not before the present tribunal the case of some aggrieved teacher would have been heard.

20118. Where would they have carried the matter—to the Law Courts?—I am afraid there might have been personal violence. One of the inspectors, quoted by Mr. Welby in his report, visited Rosegreen School on the 29th of July, 1908. On arrival he asked what was the last merit mark, which was "v.g." He looked round the school and promptly said: "I may tell you I would not give you 'v.g.," and he gave me a lecture on how to teach orthography.

20119-21.—Mr. COTTEY.—How long was he in the school?—Probably about five minutes, by the time he had his coat removed and sat behind my rostrum. I had then 35 years' service, having served an apprenticeship of 7 years, ending with special class in Marlborough Street College, the highest training given by the Board, while this inspector had five months' service. The senior inspector visited on the 29th of September, 1910. I laid his report, and my reply appears on page 208 of the Appendix to your Blue Book.

20122. The CHAIRMAN.—You say Mr. Welby visited from 9.35 to 10.55 and reported to the Board?—Yes; he reported (1) that the principal had no preparation for work for the day; (2) that he did not send in his time-table or list of books; (3) that the assistant copied his notes from the "Irish School Weekly"; (4) that at desk antithesis the principal went round just looking over the shoulders of individuals; (5) that drawing is from "moulding" to "fair"; (6) that there is little evidence of taste externally.

20123. You take up these points one by one and reply to them?—Yes; in Vol. I., Appendix IX. The second visit occurred on the 4th April, 1911. The memorial was then under way for some months. Mr. Welby made it too plain that the visit was a purely punitive one.

20124. The CHAIRMAN.—You mean that the agitation was progressing at the time?—Yes.

20125. The BUNKER or ROSE.—When was the memorial sent to the Board, because there is no date on it as far as I know?—It was sent in June, 1911.

20126. The CHAIRMAN.—The inspector's second visit took place on the 4th of April, 1911?—Yes.

20127. And the memorial had not been presented then?—It had not been presented, but it had been prepared. The agitation dated from the previous December, from the County Meeting in Thurles the previous December.

20128. And the point is that Mr. Welby came in under the influence of that feeling?—Yes, Mr. Welby made it too plain the visit was a purely punitive one. He rebuked, accused and threatened me. He then had me reprimanded for neglect of duty, meeting, and impertinence.

20129. When did that reprimand reach you?—It reached me on the 19th of May, 1911.

20130. The BUNKER or ROSE.—That was still before the memorial went in?—Yes.

20131. The CHAIRMAN.—Read that reprimand?—"Office of National Education, Dublin, 19th May, 1911. Rev. Sir,—I am directed by the Commissioners of National Education to inform you that the senior inspector reports that on the occasion of his visit to the above-named school on the 4th ult. he found the teacher, Mr. T. Kegan, standing with a draft at the far end of the room, and engaged in reading some document. The draft in question should have been receiving a reading lesson from Mr. Kegan at the time. Mr. Kegan explained that the document referred to was a pupil's exercise in composition, which he was engaged in correcting whilst he heard the pupils of the draft read. The inspector states that in pointing out to the teacher that efficient instruction in the reading lesson could not be given in such circumstances, the teacher maintained that he had a perfect right to teach in this way. The inspector adds that the teacher's manner was annoying and impertinent. I am to request that you will be so good as to reprimand him for his neglect of the reading lesson, and for his unbecoming attitude towards the inspector on the occasion referred to. I am, Rev. Sir, Your obedient Servant, W. J. DAWSON, Secretary. To Very Rev. Dean Kinane, P.P., V.G., Cashel." In correspondence which followed he supplemented his charge by stating that civility on his part was met by "rude aggressiveness" on mine. After nine months' correspondence, and an investigation by the chief inspector, the reprimand had to be withdrawn. This is the letter I wrote to the manager:—

"ROSEGREEN N.S. (18/11/1905),

"Cashel, 10th June, 1911.

"REV. SIR,—Respecting the charges made against me by Mr. Welby, S.I., as contained in the Board's letter of 19th ult., and for which you are asked to reprimand me, I beg to submit the following reply, which I request that you will kindly forward to the Board.

"I respectfully deny that there is any foundation for the charge that I neglected a reading lesson. Here are facts. I follow the bipartite system by Mr. Welby's direction. One draft was reading on the floor, the other writing composition in the desks. The reading and explanation were over before Mr. Welby arrived. During the few minutes of the reading time which remained, the draft was, under my direction, studying a certain part of the subject matter, while I, still in my place before the class, corrected the composition of one pupil—an eighth standard boy—who had finished before the others. This occupied about two or three minutes, and that is the sum and substance of the 'neglect' for which I am punished by a reprimand. I did not 'hear' the reading while correcting the exercises, and never said that I did. I have before me the last five general reports on this school by four different inspectors. As three inspections the reading was thoroughly tested, and not one word of fault with the subject occurs in the five reports. Surely, in face of these facts, the Board will not allow the reprimand for neglect to stand. I disclaim all intention of having been disrespectful to Mr. Welby, and am not even remotely conscious of anything in my demeanour that justified him in preferring against me the odious charge of being 'annoying and impertinent' in my manner; odious charges to prefer against any respectable man, but particularly odious and damaging in case of a teacher whose highest duty is the inculcation of morals and manners, and if his own manners are grossly offensive, how can he teach good manners to others? Impertinent as I regard the subject of reading, I had rather it were said of me that I turned out a pupil a mannerly scholar, rather than a beechy eloquentist. I now beg to state what really occurred during Mr. Welby's visit on 4/4/11. The visit, which was exactly of ten minutes' duration, was truly a 'surprise' and

29th July, 1913.]

Mr. T. KEEGAN examined.

[Continued]

for he managed to be standing behind my rostrum before I knew he was in school. He then called the Roll, and counted the pupils, and announced that more were marked than were actually present. He counted a second time and, with my assistance, found the number correct. He then stoode down to my desk, and the following occurred in the presence of the pupils. He first accused me of reading a 'document' when he entered the school. I instantly showed him the 'document,' which was a pupil's essay. He then rebuked me for having my hat on. I had good reason for wearing my hat on the occasion, but I instantly removed it when aware of his presence, which was more than a famous school-master thought he ought to do, in the presence of his boys, even before his sovereign. He next told me that I could not have a reading lesson and correct a composition at the same time. I said that 'I thought I had a perfect right to do as I had been doing, namely—' I was about to explain, as in par. 2, when he interrupted, and in angry and contemptuous tones retorted, 'the Commissioners will judge as to that; I'll report you.' And after thus humiliating me before my pupils, and undermining my authority over them, he now has me further punished by a suspension. It is not for me to pass judgment on my own manners. I leave that to others. I only say that during my 37 years in the Board's service the slightest exception had never hitherto been taken to my conduct and manners by any officer of the Board. Indeed, I have had the best reasons for believing that I had been fortunate enough in securing the good opinion of my superiors in that respect. I may be pardoned for giving one instance. I was one of the twelve students recalled to the Board's College for a course of special training; a distinction awarded to no student whose conduct and manners were not known after a year's close observation to be above reproach; for the special class men were supposed to be models to the students over whom they were placed. That is 30 years ago, and it is repugnant and painful to me to refer to such matters, even in self-defence. You, as my Manager and Pastor, know me intimately for four and twenty years. The senior inspector has had an opportunity of observing me for less than two hours all told. I now appeal to you to state whether, in your judgment, the odious and damaging charges made against my manners apply, and, if not, that you will demand on my behalf to have them (as well as the charge of neglect), immediately withdrawn.—I am, Rev. Sir, your obedient servant,

"T. KEEGAN.

"Very Rev. DEAN KIMBLE, etc."

No copy of manager's letter was made, but the letter was of a most complimentary character as regards the teacher.

30132. Mr. CORRY.—Did Mr. Welby threaten to report you in tones loud enough to be heard by your pupils?—Oh, decidedly. Here is the reply from Mr. Dwyer to the manager:—

"OFFICE OF NATIONAL EDUCATION,

"Dublin, 18th September, 1911.

"REV. SIR,—With reference to your letter of the 19th June, 1911, and enclosure, respecting the report of the Senior Inspector, Mr. Welby, on his visit to the above-named school on the 4th April, 1911, I am directed by the Commissioners of National Education to inform you, that having brought under the notice of Mr. Welby the statements in the letter, dated 18th June, 1911, of the principal teacher, Mr. T. Keegan, they have received a communication from Mr. Welby, in which he denies that he rebuked Mr. Keegan at the inspection of the 4th April, 1911, or spoke harshly to him in the presence of his pupils. The inspector maintains that the conversation he had with the teacher was marked with civility, and that he was met by rude aggressiveness on the teacher's part, and adds that the pupils may have heard what

the teacher said, as he spoke in a loud tone. In the circumstances the Commissioners see no reason for modifying the action taken by them in the case.—I am, Rev. Sir, your obedient servant,

"W. J. DUNNIGAN, Secretary.

"To Very Rev. DEAN KIMBLE, P.P., V.G., Cashel."

On getting this letter I wrote to the manager as follows:—

"ROCKHAMPTON N.S.,

"Closmal, 18th October, 1911.

"REV. SIR,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of Board's letter of 15th ult., re charge made against me by Mr. Welby S.I., and your and my replies thereto.

"Notwithstanding the facts and circumstances stated in my reply, your testimony, who have known me so intimately for 34 years, and the extreme improbability of supposing that any sane teacher would act towards his senior Inspector as Mr. Welby states that I acted, I regret to find that the Board persists in punishing me on the uncorroborated evidence of an official who shared such bitter hostility towards me, and treated me in the shocking manner detailed in my letter of 16th June last. When he falsely accused me of neglect or a reading lesson, I replied that 'I thought I had a perfect right to do as I had been doing, namely—' he flushed with anger and interrupted with the contemptuous and ominous threat—'The Commissioners will judge as to that; I'll report you.' The threat, I find, was not an idle one. I now respectfully ask the Board as a teacher supposed to be so mean-spirited and slavish as to reopen a case when he knows he is falsely accused of neglecting his pupils' interests, and that in their presence? Had Mr. Welby not interrupted I could have easily proved to him then, as I can still prove, that the lesson had been taught before he arrived, and that during the two or three minutes of the time which remained the draft had been, under my direction, studying part of the text, while I, still in my place before the class, corrected the essay of one pupil. To punish a teacher for neglect of reading, in these circumstances, and in face of the fact that at the last five inspections of this school by four different inspectors, not a single word of fault is found with the subject, is so astounding as to inevitably lead to the belief that there is a mistake or misapprehension somewhere. Had I been absolutely idle for those two or three minutes I don't believe that any employers in the world would punish, for such a trifle, an employee with service such as mine. But I again assert, and am prepared to prove on oath, and have several witnesses to prove that there was no neglect whatever. The indirect charge of falsification of accounts was proved on the spot to be groundless; so was the charge about reading a 'document' (evidently meaning something unconnected with school work); so was the charge of neglect. These are all matters of fact. Manners are, to some extent, a matter of opinion. Therefore, while Mr. Welby, in his reply, ignores all reference to the facts, he improves the occasion as to his opinions, and adds to the odious charges of neglect and impudence which he made against my manners, the reckless one of rude aggressiveness. I again respectfully ask will the Board persist in punishing me on the mere statement of the Senior Inspector as to my manners, notwithstanding my manager's testimony, my 37 years' record, and the extreme improbability of the charge? Mr. Welby states that the children may have heard what the teacher said. I beg to add that they certainly heard what the Senior Inspector said. And if the Commissioners are not yet convinced that they have punished me on false charges, I request that an inquiry be held on the spot, where the whole truth can be ascertained by the examination of witnesses.—I am, Rev. Sir, your obedient servant,

"T. KEEGAN.

"Very Rev. DEAN KIMBLE, etc."

22nd July, 1918.]

Mr. T. KEEGAN continued.

[Continued.]

The manager forwarded my letter to the Board, with one of his own, of which no copy was kept, and he received the following reply:—

"OFFICE OF NATIONAL EDUCATION,
" Dublin, 22nd December, 1911.

"REV. SIR.—With reference to your letter of the 16th October, 1911, and to previous correspondence on the subject of the Senior Inspector's report of his visit to the above-named school on the 4th April, 1911, I am directed by the Commissioners of National Education to inform you, that having considered your representations, and those of the principal teacher, Mr. T. Keegan, in connection with a special report furnished by the Chief Inspector, they have decided that the reprimand conveyed to Mr. Keegan in the official letter of the 16th May, 1911, be withdrawn.—I am, Rev. Sir, your obedient servant,

" W. J. DILLWORTH, Secretary.

" To Very Rev. Dean KILGEE, P.P., V.G., Cusack."

20185. Mr. COFFEY.—That reprimand would stand in the case of a teacher who had not the courage to persist in his denial of the charge?—Yes, and if the manager had not such confidence in me the reprimand would seem to have been withdrawn.

20184. The CHAIRMAN.—It seems that you owe it personally to the influence of the Dean and the weight of his character?—Yes; after nine months' correspondence and an investigation by the Chief Inspector, the reprimand had to be withdrawn. Under the old system I had several consecutive years of "thoroughly efficient" service, and "good" and "very good" under the new system. I got "very good" reports from Messrs. Bannan, Brown and McIlveney. "Very good" was essential for my increment in 1910, and also for the appointment of my son as pupil teacher. My wife is assistant. We had thus double incentive to get "very good" in 1910. It meant £10 a year to me and position at £27 to my son. Needless to say we worked all we knew how. I got the highest class and training under the Board, and my wife was equally well trained. We attended every organizer's class within a radius of 11 miles, and our efficiency was in no way impaired. Mr. Fitzpatrick inspected here (for the first time) on a cold, wet, miserable day, 5th of January, 1910, with 39 present out of 68. Some of those present came only when farm work was slack, or could not be done, and all wore wet and cold. In three circumstances Mr. Fitzpatrick reduced the mark to "good," destroying my son's and my chances at one blow. He knew the state of the case, for I told him. It may be said—why not appeal? Why should I, knowing that the appeal would be tried by the senior inspector, whose influence I believed to be really responsible for the injustice. Other inspectors followed in 1911 and 1912. Their reports, as will be seen, are virtually "very good," though not technically so (and these reports too are contradictory). The cup has thus been applied to my lips and snatched away.

20183. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, will you give me those reports that you have?—(Witness hands reports to Chairman.)

20180. I find Mr. Bannan, on the 23rd of May, 1904, gave you "very good," and wrote—"This school is successfully conducted. Second and intelligent work has been done in all branches. Reading is intelligent and distinct, but is capable of improvement as regards expression. Freshness drawing and grammatical analysis require additional attention. The work of the school merits praise." Then Mr. McIlveney, on the 8th of March, 1909, gives the mark "very good," and says—"The teaching generally is skilful and effective, and the merit mark of the school may be entered as 'very good.' Grammar, however, should be better understood, and it is desirable that the occupations for infants be more varied. Very good order and discipline are maintained." Then on the 31st of January, 1910, there was the first reduction?—Yes.

20187. Mr. Fitzpatrick gave the mark "good," and said—"A fairly correct tone of work prevails in this

school, and on the whole good progress is made. The pupils are somewhat backward in grammar and mental arithmetic. They also require much practice in spelling at the various oral lessons, so as to acquire some readiness and confidence. The written work is good." On the 20th of March, 1911, Mr. Little gave the mark "good," and wrote—"There are some very pleasantly points in the teaching of this school, and the proficiency on the whole is creditable. Marking and correction of written exercises could and should be improved. Spelling and workbooks need repair. Floors are not clean. Playground requires to be gavelled in one part. There are omissions in registers." Here is an extract from the observation book, dated 20th April, 1911 (the same inspection).—"Glad to see some gardening is being done and that nature study is cultivated. The localisation of history is a very practical step, and will impart a special interest to the subject.—Robert J. Little." Then Mr. P. J. FitzGerald, on the 7th of February, 1912, gave the mark "good," and wrote—"This school is efficiently conducted. The teachers make careful preparation, and their methods are calculated to develop intelligence. The school falls little short of 'very good,' with improvement in history, arithmetic and geography it would merit the higher mark. The gable needs cementing. Some gravel is required in yard. A small drain is also required." Those are the reports you wish to put before us?—Yes.

20188. The HONOR. MR. BROS.—Have you something more to say?—Yes, with regard to the inspection at which my mark was reduced. Mr. Fitzpatrick, as I have said, came on a cold, wet, miserable day and he examined. That was his first visit to the school, and the inspection lasted for about an hour and a half, but as he left no record of it in the observation book, so I cannot be exact as to the time, but it was, I believe, an hour and a half. For an hour of that time he had the senior draft in the school engaged in an examination in mental arithmetic and grammatical analysis. They were standing for all that time, and it is obvious to anybody who understands the strain on children who are being examined in mental arithmetic and grammatical analysis, that it was not fair to keep them standing so long, and the consequence was that the children were fagged out, and were not able to answer. It was on the strength of that examination that my merit mark was pulled down.

20189. And he confined himself principally to that one class?—To the one class. He just moved about the school and looked at the other classes for the balance of the time, and he looked over a few exercise books.

20140. The CHAIRMAN.—And that reduction cost you your increment?—Yes, and loss of my son's appointment as pupil teacher in the school. He was an intermediate student, and had been four years in Rockwell College previously.

20141. Mr. HURAN WILKINSON.—You say it cost you your increment. How much?—£10 a year.

20142. And you have not since had it restored?—No, the mark has not been restored since.

20143. And you lost the existence of a pupil teacher?—Yes, a son of mine. He was a candidate pupil teacher, and it is necessary to have "very good" in order to have a pupil teacher appointed in the school, and, of course, he could not be appointed when the mark was not "very good."

20144. And he has not been appointed?—He has not been appointed.

20145. So that you lost his existence?—Yes, and the school suffered by having a boy like that rejected.

20146. And have you had no further communication at all with regard to your increment?—None.

20147. What was the date of the lowering of the mark that you refer to?—The 21st of January, 1910.

20148. And then what was the next occasion?—The next occasion was the following year, in February, 1911, when I got only "good" from Mr. Little, but as you will see there is the reports.

20149. Mr. COFFEY.—Who was the inspector in 1909?—Mr. McIlveney.

20150. And he gave you "very good"?—He gave me "very good."

20151. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Then you had Mr. Fitzgerald in 1912?—Mr. Fitzgerald followed in 1912, and his mark is only "good," but the body of the report is equivalent to "very good."

20152. The CHAIRMAN.—He says a very little more would have sufficed to give the higher mark?—Yes, to give the higher mark "very good."

20153. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—And you have not had an inspection since?—I had an inspection during the present year, but I do not know the result officially yet; I have not got the minute.

20154. How long ago was that inspection?—It was on the 6th of May last.

20155. By whom?—By another Mr. Fitzgerald; but I believe the mark is only "good"; in fact, he told me that he would only give "good."

20156. Mr. HENLY.—And you have not got the minute from the 6th of May up to this?—No.

20157. You told me that an Inspector who visited you a short time ago made some suggestions about the teaching of orthography?—Yes, he did.

20158. What were they?—Well, he happened to come on the mis-spelling of a word in a girl's exercise book. The word was "accommodation," and the mistake was duly corrected by me in the way we were previously taught to correct those exercises. She wrote the word "accommodation" properly three times, and he said that was not the right way to correct such an error. And I asked him what was the proper way to correct it, and he said she should, instead of writing the word correctly three times, have written this:—"I wrote 'accommodation' with one m, whilst I should have written 'accommodation' with two m's," and that all exercises should have been corrected in the same fashion.

20159. And what would he have said if you had a number of errors?—As a matter of fact, she was a good speller, and the next to her, a very bad speller, had some errors, and if she adopted the same method of correction she would waste, I suppose, two or three pages in the exercise book.

20160-2. And that was the only suggestion you got from the Inspector?—That was the only suggestion I got.

20161. Mr. HENLY.—You were getting "very good" until Mr. Welpy appeared in the district, and then the mark was lowered?—The mark was lowered.

20162. Was your school, in your opinion, fully up to the standard at which it was when it was visited by previous inspectors?—I honestly believe that it was much higher, for this reason, that the attendance increased, and I had a better class of pupils, and naturally the idea of getting my now appointed pupil teacher made me put forth all my energies—both my wife and myself.

20163. Was "very good" necessary?—It was then.

20164. The CHAIRMAN.—What grade are you in?—I am what is called an intergrade.

20165. Between the second and second of first?—Yes.

20166. The BRANCO or ROSE.—What are your average numbers in the school?—Over sixty, my lord.

20167. Mr. HENLY.—The reading of local history appears to have been recommended in one of your reports?—Yes.

20168. And the succeeding inspector writes that the reading of history needs to be improved?—Yes; and I taught exactly on the same lines the second year as I did on the first.

20169. And were the boys as proficient?—I think more so, because, as I have already remarked, I had a better class of boys.

20170. Do you think it is right to administer a reprimand without any inquiry or reference to the teacher, for a fault such as that attributed to you by Mr. Welpy?—I don't think it is right.

20171. You were not asked for any explanation before the reprimand came?—None whatever.

20172. The CHAIRMAN.—On the manager?—No.

20173. Mr. HENLY.—No communication in a word

intervened between the visit of the inspector and the reprimand coming to you?—None whatever.

20174. No inquiry as to whether he was representing the facts as they occurred?—None.

20175. And then when you pressed the matter on the attention of the Commissioners they ultimately withdrew the reprimand?—That is so.

20176. You do not know on what grounds?—I cannot say.

20177. You say they referred the matter again apparently to the Inspector?—I had an investigation by the Chief Inspector, Mr. Hyne, who found the charges absolutely baseless.

20178. Was that investigation held in presence of your manager?—No.

20179. Who were present?—Nobody but Mr. Hyne and myself.

20180. Were there pupils that heard the conversation?—No; the pupils were dismissed.

20181. And he did not ask their evidence?—I mentioned that the truth could be ascertained by examination of witnesses. "What witnesses?" said he. "The pupils," said I, "that listened to the whole thing." "Oh," said he, "I won't examine the pupils."

20182. It is stated in one of these documents that the pupils could have heard the words?—He states that the pupils "may" have heard what the "teacher" said, as he spoke in a loud tone.

20183. Do you think that that is a fair way in which to put it?—I think it was not, because it manifestly suggests that I was in a temper.

20184. And the inspector too?—And the inspector cool; whereas I maintain that it was the other way about.

20185. When we have such things as this persistent lowering of reports, and such treatment of a teacher whose record seems to deserve something very different, is it wonderful that grave discontent should prevail throughout the whole of that circuit?—I should say not, because to my knowledge there are other cases as bad as mine.

20186. The CHAIRMAN.—Cases that did not come out?—Cases that were mentioned in the memorial.

20187. But had you other cases that have not been brought out?—We had; they were afraid to come out.

20188. Mr. HENLY.—They were treated as badly?—Treated worse if anything, and they had not the courage to come out.

20189. The BRANCO or ROSE.—Can you identify here those schools referred to in the memorial by the letters A, B, C, D, etc.?—I can, my lord.

20190. Those are the schools referred to on page 208. Now, what is A?—Mollinshane. The teacher, Miss Walsh, went in on paper.

20191. That was a girls' school?—Yes.

20192. B?—Gortinagowra.

20193. C?—Ballinacree.

20194. D?—Killeshale (Mr. O'Garra).

20195. E?—Cullen.

20196. F?—Miss McSwiney, Mardyle.

20197. G?—Templemore.

20198. H?—Monard.

20199. I?—Slieveagh Girls'.

20200. J?—Mabober.

20201. I suppose in your local history the ruins of Castle supply an interesting paper?—Yes, and we have other remarkable historic places in the vicinity.

20202. Both civil and ecclesiastical?—Yes, and it is on those lines that I was teaching.

20203. Mr. HENLY.—You refer to the list of schools examined by Mr. Hyne on page 215. You say that of those schools examined by Mr. Hyne there were only six on the list you submitted to him?—Yes, that is so.

20204. Will you give us the list if you please, as we want the number of those schools that are in the list on page 215. You say only six were furnished by you. What were the six?—Cullen, Monard, Mardyle, Mollinshane, Mabober, Slieveagh.

20205. And you say that of those six the report of Mr. Hyne raised the mark in four?—Yes.

20206. And, therefore, in your selected schools the mark of Mr. Welpy was wrong in the opinion of Mr. Hyne to the extent of 66 per cent.?—Yes, and

20th July, 1913.]

Mr. T. REEGAN examined.

[Continued]

furthermore, Mr. Hynes examined some of the schools, and he gave an account at all about it. Mr. Hynes raised the mark in Cullen, Mullinahone, Mohobor and Sherragh, and he left the mark as it was in Monard and Mordyke.

20200. And yet those teachers got no redress?—No, and we were told by the Commissioners that we had no case.

20201. Dr. Storkie stated to us that a wrong has been done to that circuit, and that he will try to redress it. Will you tell me how that could be redressed?—The only way in which the teachers of Tipperary, who have been wronged, can have their wrongs redressed, is by restoring the merit marks that were given under the previous inspectors, and, of course, where monetary loss followed, that loss should be made good.

20202. The CHAIRMAN.—How many teachers would that process affect—400?—Oh, no.

20203. There are about 400 in the district, are there not?—There are 300 schools in the district, practically 400; but, of course, some of them have no complaint, some of them have no grievances.

20204. The BISHOP or DEAN.—We have had considerable complaints from the North of Ireland that pecuniary obligations fall on the teachers for the equipment and upkeep of their schools. Have you had any complaint personally to make in that matter?—Yes.

20205. You had to do something?—Yes, my Lord, I had.

20206. Will you give us some idea of the amount of your obligation?—You will see it in my letter that I sent off to the school internally and externally, and that when Mr. Welgely reported that there was no evidence of taste externally I had previously laid out a plot and planted it with shrubs and flowers, of which there was a succession for the whole year nearly. Yet Mr. Welgely told the Board that there was little evidence of taste there. The manager having recently spent £18 externally. I did not like troubling him again, although I wanted to comply with the Board's view regarding decoration. The manager was most generous.

20207. Do you think the other teachers in the circuit would have spent money in this way?—I think so. In all the schools that I know they did pretty much the same thing to my knowledge. They fell as with the wish of the Commissioners to have a nice plot outside their school, and that costs money. Shrubs cost money, and creepers on the wall and other external decorations, in order to meet the official view.

20208. As a rule, were the repairs to equipment done by the managers, did they find the money as a rule for these things?—Oh, yes, for the larger things in the school; but maps, tablets, and things like that are frequently bought by the teachers out of their own private purse.

20209. Do you know any case in which the manager told the teacher he was to provide so-and-so, and was there any agreement betwixt them that they would not have to spend money on the school?—No, I am not aware of any agreement of that sort.

20210. Since the grant was made for the heating and cleaning of the schools have things been better amongst you?—Decidedly.

20211. Have the managers always found their half of the expense?—Well, it comes to this. I will give my own case. The way I manage about the half is that I raise a local subscription, with the concurrence of the manager, of course, and the pupils' parents have no objection to it.

20212. Does concurrence mean that he takes a part and helps you, or merely approves of what you do?—Well, I would say he approves of what I do.

20213. And it is known that you have his approval, and are acting under his directions?—I should think so.

20214. And that is the system generally across your district?—Well, so far as I know, my Lord, it is.

20215. And there have been no substantial complaints amongst you, as I understand you, as to the

outlay of money on the part of teachers on the school?—Well, there has been. I thought you were referring to the amount given for heating and cleaning; but otherwise I believe the teachers expend money out of their pocket the same as I do. I believe it is a general custom in our part of the country.

20216. In ornamental work, such as you described to us?—Yes, and necessary things inside, such as maps and charts. They find money out of their own pockets for those, and sometimes for other equipments, such as blackboards.

20217. Have you noticed any difference in recent times in that regard, as against, say, 10, 12, or 15 years ago?—In what respect?

20218. Whether the managers are more or less generous in reference to the schools at present than they were, say, 10 years ago?—Well, speaking for myself, my manager was always generous, and I don't know how it is in the case of other people. In fact, all I asked him for that was reasonable he always subscribed generously.

20219. Mr. CORRY.—That visit by Mr. Hynes is called an investigation by Mr. Hynes?—Yes.

20220. It was not a formal investigation—he did not notify you that he was coming to investigate?—No.

20221. He dropped into the school when he was in the circuit in November, 1911?—Yes, that is the way it occurred.

20222. And was it subsequent to his visit that the reprimand was withdrawn?—Yes, it is stated so in the Board's letter.

20223. It does not say anything about Mr. Hynes?—It does, excuse me; it says that they referred to Mr. Hynes. They refer to "A special report furnished by the chief inspector."

20224. But the fact remains that if you had not pressed the matter the reprimand would have remained against you?—Oh, yes, it would stand.

20225. And no communication was made from the Board to you in the first instance asking you for an explanation before the reprimand was sent?—None whatever; the first thing I heard about it was the reprimand. I have some suggestions to make of a constructive character with reference to inspections, but possibly some other people who are coming before you will do that.

20226. The CHAIRMAN.—I think your evidence may be valuable?—Thank you, Sir Samuel. I have documentary evidence for everything I say, and this is the letter of Father Pembroke:—

"Blackwell College, Cashel,

November, 24th, 1911.

"Having been requested by the National teachers of Circuit 18 to give my opinion, as far as it is possible for me to form one, of the efficiency of the National schools within that circuit, I hasten to do so in all justice to the teachers of these schools.

In the first place it may be asked on what grounds I venture to form an opinion of the efficiency of the National schools in the different counties of Ireland. My reply is that as President of this College I have been examining, for the past seven years, between eighty and a hundred new pupils every year who come here for the most part from the National schools of practically every county in Ireland. I consider, therefore, that I am in a position to be able to state not only in what parts of the country the clever boys are to be found, but also to form, after having examined so many boys, a very definite, and I shall say a very correct, opinion of the capability and efficiency of the teachers who give these boys their primary education.

That being the case, I now have great pleasure in stating that the boys who have come to this College for the past seven years from the schools within that circuit have shown, on examination here, a degree of proficiency which has not been surpassed by boys from schools in any other part of the country.

Many of these boys on coming here have won entrance scholarships value £15 each in competition with boys from all other counties in Ireland, and have thus proved very clearly and conclusively that the teaching given them in their respective primary schools was the best of its kind.

Some of the students, from practically every one of these schools, read a brilliant Intermediate course here, winning exhibitions and prizes in the very close competition of the Intermediate system. I have no hesitation in stating that they would never have done so unless they had got a really solid foundation in their respective primary schools.

I have passed this statement, which is the result of personal observation, to do justice to a body of very capable and devoted teachers, and in concluding it I must express my high sense of admiration of the zeal they manifest in promoting the best interests of their pupils.

T. A. PEMBERTON, C.B.S.,
President, Rockwell College."

I have another case to mention, if you will permit me. It is the case of a witness, who was unable to come, in

reference to Tinkertown School. This is his name and name—

Junior Inspector visited. Examined in mental arithmetic—put strange questions. Stated that children knew nothing of arithmetic. Same Inspector told me better schools than mine were marked "good," and that my mark was too high. Another Junior Inspector suggested changes in time-table. When examined into I found they could not be carried out. I wrote him asking how his suggestions could be carried out—got no reply. Senior Inspector at examination in needlework ordered new material and cloth for all children. Very little time given, and in observation book it was stated that "some of the needlework is indifferent." He examined none of the work finished during the year, and same work got prices 1st, 2nd, and 3rd, where 17 schools competed. At singing children got to sing where there were no appliances. Moderator chairs had to be cut down and brought into room, and then very little time given. The minute stated that "in judging the results achieved are by no means commensurate with the assistant's ability to teach the subject." Reports of this school "very good" for 16 years.

C. McKELWYN.

Mr. J. R. NASH, Principal of Templetoohy School, County Tipperary, examined.

20283. The Bishop of Ross.—You are a member of the Central Executive Committee of the teachers?—Yes, my Lord.

20284. The Chairman.—You are principal of Templetoohy School, and have been principal of Loughmore?—Yes.

20285. How many children have you in that school?—You mean the average in my present school? Well, I have been teaching in it only since last October. I left Loughmore then and got transferred from Loughmore to Templetoohy. The average of Templetoohy was 41.4 for the last quarter. I left Loughmore last October.

20286. Loughmore was one of the 13 schools examined by Mr. Hynes?—Yes, sir.

20287. And he altered the mark from "excellent" to "very good"?—He said that Mr. Welby had given a higher report than what, in his estimation, would be sufficient for the school.

20288. In what year was that "excellent" given to you by Mr. Welby?—1911.

20289. It must have been very early in the year?—In March; but I have got "excellent" as far back as 1901.

20290. What is your grade now?—I am in first grade. I was promoted. I was first class in 1898. I am now in second of first grade.

20291. And how long have you been in that?—I have been in second of first grade since April, 1912, but I have got no addition to my salary; I am paper-promoted. I was second of first class under the old regulation.

20292. Under the system before 1900 you were second of first class?—Yes.

20293. Mr. Welby inspected your school and gave you the mark "excellent" in 1911?—Yes.

20294. Who inspected your school in 1912?—Mr. Mahon.

20295. What mark did you get then?—"Excellent."

20296. Who inspected at that time?—I left that school. I told you I left that school in October, 1912; but my school in Templetoohy was also inspected by Mr. Mahon last January, and if you wish I will read the report I got from Mr. Mahon on my present school. The previous report was only "good," and I had been in charge of the school only from October to January.

20297. From October of last year?—To January of this year; and here is the report that Mr. Mahon gave last January on Templetoohy School, my present school. The previous report was only "good." He gave "very good," and he says: "The school has

entered on a new course of usefulness under the recently appointed principal. As the new building will soon be available, the school may be expected to take the highest rank in every respect."

20298. Mr. Welby has not visited you yet in your new school?—He has never visited me since 1911. He never even visited Loughmore afterwards. I wish to say that several causes have contributed towards the present estranged relations between the Irish National Teachers and the Commissioners of National Education. Some of these date from the introduction of the new regulations in 1900, by which not only the vested interests of many teachers were radically ignored, but several suffered financially to a great extent, and from the outset their incomes were less—some to the extent of £25 or £30—than what they would have been under the old regime, notwithstanding the statement of Dr. Sturges to the effect that no teacher would suffer to the extent of a penny by the introduction of the new system. In many instances the average income for the three years ended 1900 was not a fair standard on which to base the consolidated salary. In some cases new appointments had been made during these years, the schools were improving in average attendance, and the teachers were morally and legitimately entitled to what their schools were worth at the introduction of the new scheme. Even teachers whose schools improved in the years immediately succeeding the introduction of the new regulations should have their cases specially considered, when they could show that their consolidated incomes were less than what they would have been under the old regulations. Teachers transferred from small to large schools during the years 1897-1900 did not receive as consolidated salaries the incomes which they would have earned under the results system in the large schools, but the capitation and results fees earned in the small schools formed portion of the basis on which their incomes were fixed. In many cases the incomes earned during the year ended March, 1900, were much larger than the consolidated incomes. Again, teachers who had passed with special distinction on the completion of their training course in July, 1898, 1899, or 1900, were entitled to 13 class, which meant an increase of £10 per annum to their incomes, after two years efficient service. The new regulations deprived men of that concession. One year's students who completed their training course in July, 1900, were entitled to a similar privilege immediately. Several others already 13 class had given highly efficient service ranging from one to six years. They, too, were denied the monetary advantage attainable under the superseded regulations, whereby teachers

got Ist class, which meant an addition of £21 per annum, after seven years highly efficient service, or after five years efficient service and a special examination. Those teachers received no monetary advantage for the number of years' efficient service given prior to 1900. The great mistake made was that the new system was not introduced gradually, and that every precaution was not taken to safeguard the monetary interests of those in the service, so that no teacher should receive at the outset a lower salary than what his school entitled him to when the new rules came into operation. The cases of teachers who felt aggrieved by the new rules should have been specially considered, and, if necessary, examinations of the pupils, conducted on the results basis, should have been held, to judge accurately the wage-earning value of the schools concerned. Moreover, the cases of the transition teachers, as well as one year's students in training, should have been specially dealt with, as also should the cases of those who had given one or more years' efficient service towards qualifying for promotion to either division of first class. Classification was also abolished, so that many teachers in Ist class found themselves in III. and II. Grades. Under the present system, I believe, there should be no such thing as grading of teachers, especially since classification was abolished. At present it amounts to nothing, except that some teachers have higher incomes than others; this is evidenced by the fact that several highly classed teachers were placed in low grades in 1900, while the reverse was also the case. Increments should be annual, and should not be withheld except in case of inefficiency or dereliction of duty. In my opinion a great number of the hardships arising from the introduction of the new regime would have been avoided if due notification had been given of the intended change, and if abnormal cases were specially investigated. In some instances there was a temporary drop in the average attendance of pupils during the years 1897-1900, owing to epidemics or other causes, and this temporary reduction in the attendance, over which teachers had no control, militated permanently against them, as their consolidated salaries were inequitably fixed. In such cases the teachers should have been at liberty to select any three consecutive years when the attendance was normal. In proof of what I have said I shall instance some cases which have been brought under my notice by teachers. I may add, the teachers to whom I allude have signified their intention to appear before you in person and prove their cases. Other witnesses have been specially selected to deal with the undergraded question. As they will address further proof of the injustice wrought by new rules and regulations promulgated in 1900, I shall, therefore, deal with only a few cases. The first case, that with which I am best acquainted, is my own case:—

I was appointed principal teacher of the Loughmore Boys' School in February, 1899. Was then in Ist class. The average attendance of pupils prior to my appointment was 26. The efficiency was so low that the manager's attention was directed to it in the last report received by my predecessor, and he was requested to admonish the teacher. In June, 1899—four months after my appointment—an examination was held under the results system. Forty pupils were examined. Of these, only thirteen from second class upwards were eligible for earning the full results fee; the others had been previously examined in the same classes, and were, therefore, of little value as earners of results fees. As the result of the examination I received the following report:—"The present teacher has been in charge of the school since February last. The school has, however, been very much improved. The written exercises are neater and more accurate. The oral answers are more distinct and correct, though in this respect there is still room for improvement. The pupils generally showed considerable evidence of careful training."

20241. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—What is the date of the report that you are reading?—June, 1899. Before the new rules came into operation in 1900 the attendance had increased to forty-eight. I promoted all the pupils after the examination held in June, 1899. I taught code and memorisation, algebra, and bookkeeping, to all the pupils of the fifth and sixth classes.

Also taught a monitor gratuitously for four years, when he entered the Marine Clerkship. I had been under the impression an examination—not an inspection—would be held in June, 1900, especially as there was no other feasible means by which what my income would have been under the old regime could be ascertained. On the morning of the examination the inspector told me there would be no examination, but an inspection. I recognized at once that I was to be a victim under the 1900 regulations, notwithstanding Dr. Sturges's assurance that no teacher would suffer to the extent of a penny by the change. I received the following report as the result of the inspection:—(June, 1900.) "The school continues to make progress under the present teacher. The infants' exercises in drill and tell frame were useful. Grammar, geography, and arithmetic have been very well taught; as have also algebra, geometry and mensuration, and book-keeping. The defect of the school is to be found in the reading, which is indistinct, and the recitation of poetry, which is below the very low average of the district. Discipline and order are good, and class movements are carried out with precision." In this report the inspector emphasises the fact that the extras were very well taught, but I received no fees for the teaching of extra, although I had taught them since June, 1899, and did not receive notice that the fees would not be forthcoming. Over sixty pupils were eligible for examination that year; all had been promoted to new classes after previous examination; extras had been taught for the first time in the school; and the proficiency had improved, as the report certifies; yet all counted for nothing in the fixing of my salary. My consolidated salary—£24 per annum—was made up of (a) first class salary; (b) capitation and results earned in the school for the year ended May, 1899, of which period I had taught only four months. To make matters worse, I was penalised for raising the average attendance. Only about 28 10s. had been included as capitation when consolidating my salary; afterwards when deducting the capitation it was deducted on the then average attendance—forty-eight—making my salary £22 (exclusive of capitation).

20242. Mr. HENRY.—When they deducted the capitation payment on the 48 was not that paid to you at the end of the year?—But you must remember that I had kept the average up to that. If I had left the average at 26, at which it was when I came to the school, I should have been in second grade instead of third grade. Had I not raised the attendance of the pupils the sum deducted would have been 26 10s. and my salary, exclusive of capitation, would have been 487 10s.

20243. Are you strengthening your case?—Here is the point. If I had not raised the average attendance I would have been placed in the second grade, but by raising the average it caused a larger amount to be deducted.

20244. They took off 48 times five shillings?—Yes.

20245. And they paid you that sum back at the end of the year?—They did, for I kept the average up to 48; but if I had left the average at 26 and not raised the average until after my salary had been fixed it would have been better for me; but by my raising the average the consolidated salary, exclusive of capitation, was reduced, and it placed me below the minimum for second grade. Had I not raised the attendance of pupils the sum deducted would have been 26 10s. and my salary, exclusive of capitation, would have been 487 10s. Hence if I had not raised the attendance I would have been placed in the second grade, but by my raising the attendance, in a twelve-month, from 26 to 48 I rendered myself an intergrade, between 3rd and 2nd grades. This was surely encouragement to a young teacher commencing his professional career! The manager wrote relative to the matter and the reply from the Education Office was to the effect that if the school improved under me in the future it would be to my advantage. I mentioned the matter to the district inspector, Mr. Lynam, and he said it and another were the two worst cases of injustice in the district.

20246. What did that mean?—That it was a gross injustice, and that I was very badly treated. Some time afterwards the late Mr. Strogo

24th July, 1913.]

Mr. J. B. NASH examined.

[Continued.]

visited the school, and I mentioned the reply the managers received from the Board. His comment on it was: "Live horse and you'll get grass." My school was worth me at least £30 per annum more than I received as consolidated salary in 1900. My present salary is about what I should have started with as consolidated salary, though I received increments and promotion in the ordinary course. When the triennial period had terminated in 1908 I received an increment of £7 instead of £10. Had my salary been only the maximum of third grade I would have got £19 an increment. The following reports have been received by me since 1900:—

Year	Nature of Report.
1901	Excellent.
1902	Good (no very good as merit mark this year.)
1903	Very good.
1904	Very good.
1905	Very good.
1906	Excellent.
1907	Excellent.
1908	Excellent.
1909	Very good.
1910	No inspection.
1911	Excellent.
1912	Excellent.

I got the Carlisle and Blake premium for the year ended 31st December, 1907. Was a candidate for junior inspectorship in September, 1908, when Mr. Kelly was appointed. Left the Loughmore school last October, and was appointed to Templetoohy Boys' School. The previous report of this school was "good." I received the following report from Mr. Mahon:—Date of examination, 14th January, 1913; "very good." The school has entered a new career of usefulness under the recently appointed principal. As the new building will soon be available the school may be expected to take the highest rank in every respect." The Commissioners granted special promotion to first grade on six "very good" reports. It is surprising that I, who was so very badly treated in 1900, who failed the average attendance from 26 in 1909 to 85 in 1912, whose record is as above stated, got no special consideration of any kind. I was promoted to first grade—paper promoted—on 1st April, 1912; but have to wait probably for some years before I receive the salary attached to the higher grade. Under the superannuated regulations I should have experienced little difficulty in securing first of first class on the first available opportunity. This would have increased my salary by £21 per annum.

20257. The Chairman.—Are there other cases?—That is only a typical case of what occurred under the 1900 regulations.

20258. It is a typical case we want. We could not go into every case—I understand.

20259. The Chairman or Boss.—You have been very successful both at Loughmore and Templetoohy in raising the quality of the school at a very short time?—Yes, my Lord.

20260. After coming from Loughmore you were there for a few months?—Yes.

20261. You went to Templetoohy in October?—Yes.

20262. And you were inspected in January?—Yes.

20263. And the change between October and January was very considerable?—Yes.

20264. And, of course, you would hardly have two months teaching at that time, as the Christmas holidays came in?—Yes.

20265. So that in those two months you did very good work?—Yes, I received the report from "good" to "very good."

20266. So, therefore, it would seem that it is possible to restore a school, at least prospectively, in a short time?—Well, I daresay the Inspector took into account my method of dealing with it, and the discipline, and organisation.

20267. The report was given to you by the Inspector, not so much for what actually occurred, as for what

he saw would happen?—Yes, I suppose so, he saw the discipline and order and how the work was going on.

20268. The Chairman.—I think you had better briefly summarise the complaints of the other teachers?—I would prefer to keep to the order of my speech, and would sooner deal with Mr. Hynes's visit first.

20269. I think you requested the Committee to hear you on those cases?—Yes, if there was sufficient time.

20270. What is the other point which you consider more important?—The visit of Mr. Hynes to Loughmore School. I have a statement on that. I will deal with the other cases afterwards.

20271. That is one of the 14 schools?—Yes, and the reason I am so particular about that is on account of my name being in the Blue Book, that Mr. Welpy gave me a report to which I was not entitled.

20272. Mr. Hynes lowered you to "very good"?—Yes, he thought it was only worthy of "very good."

20273. That is what I wish to say about Mr. Hynes?—I see by the statement of Mr. Hynes, Chief of Inspection, which appears in an appendix to the published volume of evidence given before the Committee, that from an impression formed on the 20th November, 1911, he considered Mr. Welpy was too lenient in the case of the Loughmore Boys' School, and that the report—"excellent"—which the latter gave in March, 1911, should, in the opinion of Mr. Hynes, be "very good."

In dealing with this matter I shall endeavour to show that Mr. Hynes took no steps to ascertain the merit mark the school deserved. In fact, I anticipated from his manner, his remarks, and his examination, that his object in coming was to make out a case showing Mr. Welpy had given a higher merit mark than the school deserved.

In the first place, there was no necessity for his coming to visit my school, as I had made no complaints against Mr. Welpy. I considered Mr. Welpy a most searching examiner. He examined every class minutely in almost every subject. The pupils were very well prepared and answered splendidly. So impressed was he with their answering that when I asked his opinion of the school he said it was one of the best, if not the very best, in the district.

20274. You are one of the men who had no complaint to make against Mr. Welpy?—I made no complaint against Mr. Welpy.

20275. And yet your school was selected?—Yes, and that was the case of seven others of the 14 he visited. There were no complaints from seven of those. I asked his opinion of the school, and he said it was one of the best, if not the very best, in the district. He spent from 9.15 a.m. till about 1.30 p.m. in the school. My reports for 1906, 1907, and 1908, had been "excellent." Mr. Yates lowered the report in 1909 after Mr. Welpy's advent to the circuit to "very good," though the children were at least as well prepared as they had been in previous years. I had no inspection in 1910, and Mr. Welpy raised the report to "excellent." I was led to believe that Mr. Hynes had his mind made up before he entered the school as to how he would report.

20276. Mr. Keenan.—How were you led to believe that?—Because if he wanted to form a true estimate of the school, whether it deserved "excellent" or "very good," the only way he could do it was by examination of the pupils.

20277. You say you were led to believe before he entered the school that he had his mind made up?—That is not my statement, what I said is "I was led to believe that Mr. Hynes had his mind made up before he entered the school."

20278. You had formed that opinion?—No; but I was led to believe that Mr. Hynes had his mind made up by the way in which he acted, and by his not taking steps to ascertain what merit mark the school was really worth.

20279. Mr. Carson.—How?—So continued was I that was the case that I mentioned it that evening to some teachers to whom I was writing, though I had no opportunity of verifying my suspicions till I saw his statement published. He came shortly after one o'clock. He complained of the size of the school-room, and said it was a torture to be teaching in so small a room. I pointed out to him that I found the size of the room so inconvenient, as the time-table was arranged to suit it, and the discipline was good.

He spent about a half or three-quarters of an hour and examined the sixth standard only. He examined them on reading, recitation of poetry, analysis of compound sentences—asking them to distinguish between simple compound and complex compound sentences. He also examined on mental arithmetic. They answered well. He next examined them on mathematical geography—asking such questions as the exact shape of the earth; why is the earth an oblate spheroid? why was it bulged at the equator and flattened at the poles, etc.? He then examined oral spelling, asking the pupils in each case to form a sentence containing the word spelled. The words were taken from lists of difficult words in a pupil's exercise book, and included—rustments; alternate; incipient, etc. The pupils hesitated, and failed in some cases to form the sentences, and he turned and said to me sarcastically: "Do you call these good boys?" I said: "Yes, I do, and if you put them in the dock, and give them a little time, they will form the necessary sentences; but on the spur of the moment I could hardly do so." I afterwards told him that by his examination he could form no correct estimate of the state of the efficiency of the school, and that he could form no correct idea about it. He maintained that by an examination of the sixth standard he could tell what the school was worth, and how the rest of the pupils had been taught. That was surely absurd, considering that the senior boys had been away during the summer months in the bog and harvesting the crops, and had just returned to school. I then told him that the best boy in the school was absent, and he replied it made no difference, as he judged by the character of answering of the entire standard, and not by the answering of an individual boy. This boy at 14½ years of age took first place the following year at an examination held for Freshmen's Scholarships at Rockwell College. Another boy whom Mr. Hynes examined, and who was only 12½ years, also took a Freshman's Scholarship at Rockwell College the next year. If the impression formed by Mr. Hynes of the Loughmore Boys' School was correct, it is strange I got an "excellent" report from a new inspector the next year. The pupils of the sixth standard were examined the following June in the 3rd year's course of mathematics, and the inspector praised them highly. Some of the senior pupils had been receiving special instruction to fit them for competition at public examinations. And though the attendance was comparatively small, year after year my pupils took two and sometimes three scholarships at different colleges, as well as winning the Technical Scholarships granted by the North Tipperary Technical Committee. I left Loughmore School last October, and was appointed to Templeton School. I have mentioned the foregoing facts to show that the estimate of Mr. Hynes with regard to Loughmore Boys' School was not a correct one, and that he could not, by his method of examination, and the time spent in the school, form a correct idea as to what moral mark the school deserved. To my mind his action shows what little confidence teachers can place in a re-examination held by a senior inspector, or chief of inspection, as the result of an appeal. Mine was not the only school visited by Mr. Hynes that had not sent complaints. Of the thirteen schools he reported on the teachers of seven had not sent complaints.

20290. Mr. CORRY.—Is that all you have to say on Mr. Hynes's visit?—That is all I say.

20291. You have taken vengeance on him?—Not vengeance. I told Mr. Hynes that he could not form any idea of what my school was worth without full examination.

20292. Sir HUGH WILKINSON.—You have taken better vengeance still, by getting "excellent" next year?—One of the boys whom Mr. Hynes examined, and who was only 12½ years of age, took a Freshman Scholarship at Rockwell College.

20293. Mr. CORRY.—You said that Mr. Hynes came, there to make out a case. To make out what case?—For Mr. Weply, and show the National Board that Mr. Weply was not only just, but even too lenient

in some cases. My idea of his examination was this, that seeing that I had no complaint against Mr. Weply, his coming there (as I mentioned at the time) was to make believe that in my case Mr. Weply had acted too leniently. He could not have come for the purpose of saying that Mr. Weply had treated me unfairly.

20294. Mr. HENRY.—Did Dr. Starke visit your school?—Yes, Dr. Starke visited my school.

20295. You have not told us anything about that?—I did not think it was necessary, as nothing of importance occurred during the visit.

20296. Mr. KETTER.—Did you think it was unreasonable that your school should have been examined?—I would not consider it unreasonable, but there were schools in the district that had sent forward complaints, and those schools were not visited. I thought that Mr. Hynes's coming was to ascertain were there any legitimate grounds for those complaints that had been mentioned in the memorial.

20297. The HONORABLE MEMBER.—And would not that be unusual, and really a duty, to find out whether there were legitimate grounds for the complaint?—But I had no complaint, my Lord.

20298. Mr. KETTER.—The point is this, that one matter that had to be inquired into was the uniformity of standard?—Yes.

20299. In order to determine that, would it not be reasonable to include in the list of schools visited a school that had obtained the mark of "excellent"?—Certainly, I suppose so. There is nothing unreasonable in it.

20300. Was it not even necessary?—But I thought Mr. Hynes's coming was in connection with the memorial that we had sent forward, to see were there real grievances that were mentioned in that memorial. It was to look these grievances, I thought, that he was coming to the school.

20301. Mr. HENRY.—But you have not told us what Dr. Starke did, and it has an important bearing on the matter. What did he do?—Dr. Starke and Mrs. Starke and Mr. Dilworth entered my school, and before he came to my school he went to my wife's school at Templeton. He came into my school and he looked at the exercise books; and Mrs. Starke and Mr. Dilworth got the 2nd and 3rd standards, which were combined, to read. Mr. Dilworth mentioned to me afterwards that he could not know how I had brought this junior class to such perfection in the reading. Dr. Starke did not examine. He just looked over the exercise books and the composition work, and then I called up the senior standards, and Mr. Dilworth opened an advanced reader which I had been using and told them to open a certain page, and got them to read and then asked them a few questions in mental arithmetic, and his visit lasted only 20 minutes.

20302. Did he make any observation?—He made no observation; but simply made an entry in the book.

20303. He has given in evidence here that he referred that school to Mr. Hynes, because he thought it marked too highly?—When he entered the school he called me up and he said to me: "Mr. Nash, what grievances have you against Mr. Weply, as it because he gave you 'excellent'?" I said: "Well, Dr. Starke, I have no particular grievances against Mr. Weply. I consider that he examined very minutely, and somewhat on the old results lines." "Oh, I must see," said he, "that he does not do that again." "Well, why did you sign this memorial?" "I signed it," said I, "on behalf of the teachers. I am the teachers' representative of about 18 on the Central Committee of the Irish National Teachers' Organisation, and I signed it on their behalf, and it was mentioned at the end of the memorial 'signed on behalf of the teachers.'"

20304. Did he give you any indication that he thought your school marked too high?—No, he gave no indication.

20305. That has been stated in evidence here, and that was given here in evidence as his justification for

29th July, 1913.]

Mr. J. B. NASH examined.

[Continued]

referring that school to Mr. Hyman?—He did not mention anything in connection with it. Even Mr. Dilworth mentioned to me afterwards before they left that the children were spoiled.

20226. How long did Mr. Hyman take to examine your school?—About half an hour; from half to three quarters of an hour.

20227. And on that occasion he put three questions that you refer, and it was unreasonable and unfair I consider to ask them to put those words in sentences. You have read Mr. Dale's report?—Yes, I have.

20228. And you have seen that Mr. Dale has referred to the inability of the children in Ireland to frame a sentence containing several words as being a fault?—I said: "If you gave those children time and put them in the desks they would do it."

20229. Still it was a matter that should not have been sprung on you?—Yes, and I told him that if I got those words myself on the spot of the moment I would pause before I could put them in sentences.

20230. And was he hurrying the children so as to pass them?—I would not say that by any means. The only thing I noted was that he turned to me and said: "Do you tell these good boys?" though they had proved themselves good boys.

20231. You used these words, "that Mr. Hyman could have no idea of the state of the school"?—Well, I think he could form no correct estimate. I should like to amend that expression.

Sir HENRY WHARTON.—What you said was, "he could not form a correct idea—in fact, no idea."

20232. Mr. HENRY.—You say teachers entitled to special promotion did not get it?—Yes, and I was one of those. According to the rules I understand that every teacher that gets six "goods" gets special promotion.

20233. Six "very goods" and also a certain number of years' service?—Yes; I had been teaching since 1864 and I had given 15 years' service, and I should have got special promotion in June, 1909. And then there is another teacher who has sent me his case, Mr. Hagarly. I will just mention his case.

20234. Give us the number of "very goods," and service, and average?—He was appointed principal on the 4th of December, 1902. The report of the school in 1902 was "fair," in 1903 "good," in 1904 "very good," in 1905 "very good," 1906 "very good," 1907 "very good," 1908 "very good," 1909 "very good," and 1910 "good." He was recommended for the Carlisle and Blake premium in 1909 and did not get it after the visit of a senior inspector, Mr. Hayden, though he was well pleased with the school. Having six "very goods," he did not get special promotion to first grade.

20235. How was it that he did not get the Carlisle and Blake prize?—I do not know really.

20236. There is no competition between teacher and teacher in the year that is awarded?—I cannot account for how he did not get the Carlisle and Blake premium, but instead of getting it he got his report next year lowered to "good."

20237. By whom?—By Mr. McGlade; and the average of the school is at present 18.

20238. The CHAIRMAN.—How many "very goods" had he got before that?—Six, so that he was entitled to special promotion.

20239. Mr. HENRY.—And did he make application for it?—I think so.

20240. You have no evidence?—I have his own statement here. I do not know whether he has made application or not; but he will come up as a witness himself if necessary. Then I will mention here in connection with Hagarly's case that he got six "very goods" and no special promotion; he missed getting the Carlisle and Blake premium and next year his report dropped to "good," though naturally the teacher worked harder at that time, and when Mr. McGlade left the district the report was raised again to "very good."

20241. The CHAIRMAN.—I suppose the point of a good deal of the evidence is that 1909 was somehow or other a fatal year?—A fatal year.

20242. Mr. KETTER.—The other part of your evidence referred to your complaint about the unfair fixing of your salary in 1907?—The manager of my school applied to the Board and the reply he got was that as the school improved under me in future it would be to my advantage. I could have very little difficulty in getting first of first class. I got second place in secular knowledge in leaving the college in 1894, and I got second of first class in 1900. My income now at present is what I should have started with in 1900, and if under the old system I should have been now earning at least £20 a year more than what I am getting.

20243. Your appeal was fruitless at any rate?—Yes, and the manager did not try it again; but I believe if my manager had fought the case properly and had continued to fight the case, and if I had not been so young then as I was, I would have got some redress, because I know a case where the manager applied for promotion for the teacher and the manager was refused, and he applied again and he was refused, and we let the matter drop for 12 months and we reconsidered the Commission individually, and the promotion was granted at the next meeting.

20244. Are you thinking of having another shot yourself?—Well, it was I myself drafted the circular for this teacher that got his promotion and sent it to the individual Commissioners.

20245. The CHAIRMAN.—You are still hanging in air—you have not got proper promotion yet?—Yes, I am paid second grade salary still.

20246. But you might get it any day?—Well, it might be five or ten years.

20247. I think as a rule it is not much more than 18 months?—It depends on the number of vacancies year by year.

20248. What rise of salary would that give you?—£10 a year, and that might not take place for three or four years.

20249. Mr. KETTER.—I think you have gathered by this that not the National Board but the Treasury are responsible for that?—Oh, yes, I cannot refer to that; but I may refer to the fact that my salary was inequitable fixed at the start. Considering that they had no ground to go on for my salary they should have held an examination in 1900 on the old results basis, and determined my salary from that. They had no other means of ascertaining what the school was then worth, or of equitably fixing my salary.

20250. The CHAIRMAN.—I remember that you said that you had some idea once of going in for a junior inspectorship?—Yes, in 1908.

20251. That would be, of course, a rise of salary to you beyond your present rate?—Yes.

20252. But it is a very small salary?—That was the year that I got the Carlisle and Blake premium, and the junior inspector appointed had not taught previously at all in a National school; he had no experience of teaching.

20253. Do you often find inspectors who have never had any experience of teaching?—Well, that was one, Mr. Kelly. He taught in a secondary school; but he never taught in a primary school.

20254. You do not regard teaching in a secondary school as being sufficient; but that it should be in a primary school?—Well, there is a great difference between the two, and it is very hard for a man accustomed to teach in a secondary school to bring himself down to the level of the primary school, and I think that under the circumstances the National school teachers have better claim than men who never taught in a National school.

20255. Mr. KETTER.—You would not lay it down as a rule that the inspector should have taught in a National school?—No, I would not go so far as that. I think that the inclination should be to appoint teachers of experience, especially when they would be very efficient. It would be an inducement to teachers who work up their schools if these positions were reserved for them.

20256. About that financial matter that you mentioned, you say that was a typical case?—I say it is one of the many cases that I have here.

20327. That is the unfair or inequitable fixing of the salaries in 1909?—Yes. I do not know when Dr. Smalley said "No teacher should suffer to the extent of a penny," but it, at the time, impressed itself on my mind.

20328. The *Burner or Ross*.—Was the Executive Committee of the teachers requested some years ago to send forward to the National Board a number of cases like yours?—Yes. I did not agree with the suggestion that was proceeding. The matter started outside the Central Executive, and it was to this effect, that those teachers who had been first of first class should get first of first grade salary, and I would not agree with that. My idea was that all those teachers that suffered financially should be recompensed.

20329. But did the Executive select six cases for consideration by the National Board?—They did, afterwards.

20330. And the National Board went into those cases individually, and the National Board rightly or wrongly found that there was no substance in the cases?—Yes.

20331. Then were the Executive asked again for further cases?—I do not remember, my Lord.

20332. And before those six were selected by the Executive are you aware that the National Board had already considered a number of cases?—I know that one in the commencement several teachers did not get sufficient consideration.

20333. I mean in the last couple of years?—I do not know.

20334. It is a fact that the Executive were asked to supply six cases and they did?—Yes, and we do not know what facts the Commissioners went on.

20335. Now I suppose they did send in the cases, as a fact?—Yes.

20336. And then what I want to get at is this, that the Board considered those cases and rightly or wrongly did not agree with the Executive?—Yes.

The *Burner or Ross*.—So that it is not correct to say that they never considered any of those cases in recent times.

20337. Mr. HENRY.—But did the Board supply you with any information as to the grounds they had for their decision that the teachers had no claim in those cases?—They did not give us any information. I understand that the Executive applied for that very information and they did not get it.

20338. The *Burner or Ross*.—I was under the impression until quite recently, the last few days, that any of those 2,700 cases were never re-considered in recent times; but you say that they have been?—Well, my case was never considered.

20339. It was not sent forward as one of the six?—It was not, but it was sent up by the manager.

20340. Mr. HENRY.—You heard of one man who came before us who got his case reconsidered?—Yes, Mr. Miller. And I may state that my wife is just as badly treated. She was principal in Ballynashill, with an average of 55, and in 1900 she had an average of 50 in Templestuby, and did not get a penny increase of salary, and the capitation was deducted then on the 60 in the new school, though the amount added was calculated on an average of 35 pupils.

20341. The Chairman.—Have you any other point to bring before us?—Yes. I would like to refer to some of the rules that deal very harshly with teachers. I wish to mention the case of Miss Hennessey who was junior assistant mistress in Tolerton N.S. She was appointed there in March, 1893, as workmistress. Her salary was 48 per year, then afterwards she got 412 and next got 418, and afterwards she taught as manual instructress at 424. Then in 1906 when junior assistant mistresses were introduced she became a junior assistant mistress, and she got the Barrell grant after two years, and she was therefore efficient. During all that time the average was practically over 50; but then a new rule called 86 (a) was made by the National Board about two years ago, and it was to this effect, that where the average was over 50 the junior assistant mistress's service should be dispensed with and a fully qualified assistant appointed. She has suffered

there because the average there after 10 years' service had been raised to over 50, and it was mainly through her own exertions that the average was over 50. In April, 1912, the manager got notice that her services should be dispensed with, and to give her three months' notice, and to appoint a fully qualified assistant; and so all this occurred after 20 years' service, and now when she is unfit for any other position she is thrown out, and she is now completely penniless, and has to end her days I suppose in the workhouse. And that shows that the Commissioners in making rules completely ignore the vested rights of teachers in the service. Miss Hennessey was appointed workmistress on the 1st of March, 1893. The grievance is this, Miss Hennessey was workmistress in the Tolerton National School, Oakley at 48. Then afterwards her salary was raised to 412, and it was next raised to 418 a year. She afterwards taught as manual instructress at 424 a year. Then she was appointed junior assistant mistress in 1906 and she got the Barrell grant, which shows that she was efficient, as it is only given after two years' efficient service. The average during the whole time of her employment and since her appointment had been invariably over 50. As a result of the operation of rule 86 (a) her services were dispensed with in April, 1912, without any compensation whatsoever. That rule is that when the average reaches 50 a junior assistant mistress must be dispensed with and a fully qualified assistant appointed, and I may mention that we brought that matter before the Board this month 12 months, and we showed how unjust it was to deprive this lady of her position after 20 years' service, and the rule has since been amended, so that it will not now apply to junior assistant mistresses in such circumstances.

20342-3. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—But it has not been applied to her?—No. If she was in the school with the rule in its present amended form she would not have been dismissed.

20344. That is that the amended rule did not apply to a person already dismissed. She was thrown out of the position because there is a fully qualified assistant there since she was dismissed, and it was only recently that the rule was amended and the alteration of the rule shows that there was hardship?—Yes.

20345. And in her case that hardship has not been redressed?—It has not been redressed.

20346. The *Burner or Ross*.—The average had been 60. The average had been reduced from 60 to 50 for the appointment of an assistant long before she was dismissed.

20347. And it would be well to bring that in, that it was in the interests of education and for the benefit of the infants. If you make a one-sided case you do not strengthen it?—At this particular time when this rule was made, and even before it was made, for some years the average to warrant the services of an assistant was 50, and she was not dismissed, and even during the term of her office the old average was 50 and it was raised to 70 and it did not apply to existing assistants, showing that there was then a different mode of procedure from what there is now. At that time when the average was raised from 50 to 70 it did not apply to assistants in the service.

20348. Mr. COFFEY.—The point of your evidence is that new rules are made without proper consideration of the rights of teachers?—With total disregard to the vested rights of teachers.

20349. And that although on recent occasion rules have been amended, still the hardships have not been removed?—The only case in which the hardship has been removed is in connection with the maternity rule. They got the money refunded to them.

20350. The *Burner or Ross*.—She was not a whole-time officer before she became a junior assistant mistress?—She was a workmistress, and then teaching as a manual instructress.

20351. But she had not to spend the whole time at the school?—She was a manual instructress. I do not know the old rule. She was getting 424 a year as manual instructress.

Mr. RICHARD QUINN, Principal of Rathkevin School, Chunnel, examined.

20352. The CHAIRMAN.—How long have you been principal of Rathkevin School?—Just thirteen years.

20353. Were you a principal before that?—No; I acted as assistant in Dublin here, at first in Queen Street, and afterwards in Great Brunswick Street, S. Andrew's School.

20354. How many years altogether?—In Dublin I was practically four.

20355. Mr. QUINN.—How long in St. Andrew's School?—Well, two years.

20356. The CHAIRMAN.—And before those four years where were you?—I was assistant only in those two schools. At St. Paul's National School, Queen Street, and St. Andrew's National School, Great Brunswick Street.

20357. That was the beginning of your service?—That was the beginning of my service.

20358. And thirteen years in your present school?—Yes, being sixteen years' service altogether.

20359. Now, you have put into our hands a list of your reports from 1903?—Yes, these are the reports while the present staff has been in charge. I have had an assistant since 1906.

20360. That is eight years, and you must have been appointed to that school about 1903?—In 1900.

20361. Just as the new system came in?—Just as the new system came in.

20362. The first report is in January, 1905, from Mr. Bannan. Mark, "very good." "Progress very satisfactory. Town good. Discipline well maintained."

January 10th, 1906, same inspector. Mark, "very good." "School carefully taught. Progress of pupils very satisfactory."

January 11th 1907, Mr. Brown. "Very good." "School well taught, training of pupils creditable."

October 11th, 1907, same inspector. Mark, "very good." "Instruction careful and effective."

Both teachers seasons. They train and teach the children very well." Then 1908 is apparently omitted?—There was no annual inspection in the year 1908.

20363. Mr. HENRY.—Was that the calendar year 1908 or the school year?—It was the calendar year. There was an examination in the school year 1907-8, namely, in October, 1907, and one in the school year 1908-9, also held in February, 1909.

20364. The CHAIRMAN.—The next is February, 1909. Mr. Brown. Mark, "very good." "The teachers are attentive and succeed very well in instruction and training of the pupils."

Then September 9th, 1909, Mr. Welpy comes. He gave you "good," dropping one point. He says—"Proficiency not higher than 'good'."

—Yes, and I heard in the reports.

20365. Mr. Welpy, in his report of the examination of 6th September, 1909, says—"A new schoolhouse is much needed for this locality. The general proficiency is not higher than 'good.' Penmanship in the junior standards, grammar, geography and arithmetic should all be much better taught. The infants require better training and teaching. More thought should be given to the effective organisation of the school, regular preparation for daily work should be made by each teacher, and the methods of instruction confined to Notes for Teachers should be carefully studied and applied. There is no clock, and the desks are rather old."

Now, did he make those remarks to you in the school before he wrote that report—did he tell you of these faults?—They are in the observation book.

20366. Mr. HENRY.—But did he tell you really?—I do not remember whether he told me really or not.

20367. The CHAIRMAN.—Had you any conversation with him at all?—Very little.

20368. Then we come to his report two years afterwards, dated 27/4/1911. Mr. Welpy gave you "good," and says—"The principal renders very good service on the whole, but that of the assistant does not rank above 'fair,' and Miss Sheehan should make a better effort to impart thorough and effective instruction. Reading is not so tasteful as it might be made; the pupils should be smarter and more alert; the infants need better teaching and training. Object lessons should be more skillfully taught, and geography should receive more attention. The organisation of the school, too, might very well be better. There is no clock in the school."

Now we come to the change of mark on the 13th of June, 1912. Miss Margaret Bourke was the inspector, and she gave you "very good"?—Yes, sir.

20369. And said—"Work is going on very well. Both teachers are working earnestly, and discipline and order are excellent. The room is uncluttered. The inside made patching. More careful dusting is needed. There is no inscription. Out-rooms are too close to school. Some new desks, map of Europe, and scale map of locality are needed." And then the last report is dated the 9th of January, 1913, by Mr. Dunlop?—Yes.

20370. Was he a junior inspector?—He is a junior inspector.

20371. And he gave you "very good," and he says—"The character of the work done in this school is very satisfactory. The teachers are earnest and diligent. The pupils bright and intelligent, and a good spirit of work prevails. The written work is carefully executed, supervised and corrected, but the teaching of writing to the infants might be improved. The arithmetic of fourth standard was weak, and notation and nomenclature should be better understood in the first and second standards. Elementary science is successfully taught, and the pupils answer intelligently in this subject."

Those are all the reports?—Yes.

20372. You say in your précis:—"Inspectors who examined before and after Mr. Welpy were friendly and helpful." Now, helpful in what way?—Well, Mr. Brown, who came immediately before Mr. Welpy, very often gave model lessons himself.

Mr. Bannan made suggestions quietly, and showed me often the methods adopted in other schools without trying to force them on me, and I found him very helpful in that way. Mr. Dunlop did both. He gave the methods adopted in Model School, Derry in which he was teacher before he became inspector, and he taught lessons also. Miss Burke did likewise.

20373. Took a class before you?—Took a class in my presence.

20374. And did Mr. Welpy not do that?—Oh, never. Mr. Welpy never made a useful suggestion during any of his visits to the school, and never taught a lesson while he was there on any occasion that he visited.

20375. Your complaint on page 206 of our appendix is about the examination on March 14, 1911. You say—"Now, I am prepared to admit that the infants were backward, but in justice to the assistant, whose increment should be low due, I must say that the proficiency of the first and second standards was, in my opinion, very good, and if they did fail to answer it was because they were terror-stricken by Mr. Welpy's behaviour."

—Yes, that is so. He took the children out on the floor (they were accustomed to work arithmetic on desks), and he put them to work arithmetic on the floor standing, with papers and pencils in their hands. Well, the children were not accustomed to that, and did not at once respond to his orders, and he immediately made this remark—

20376. Would you say they were somewhat awkward?—Yes, they were, very much, because they were accustomed to sit, and he said—"This state of affairs should not exist in any school that calls itself 'good' ('in any school,' or 'in a school')."

20377. You say he appeared to be in a passion; are you quite sure of that?—Yes.

20378. There is no mistake about that?—No mistake whatever. He shouted at the top of his voice in the school.

20379. Particularly to one dull girl you say?—Yes, that is a very dull girl, one of those girls who if treated harshly cannot answer at all. If frightened she cannot reason properly.

20380. Now, what Mr. Welpy says is on page 212. He denies it, does he not?—He says he does not remember it.

20381. Yes, he says that he does not recall it, and he says—I do not recollect at all the incident of the note-book falling on the floor. You say he threw it on the floor?—I said he dashed his note-book from him on the table, and he said that with such force that it went from the table to the floor.

20382. He says he does not remember: in fact his answer is that he does not remember any of these things?—But he remembers that something occurred, for he says—"He supplies some details to show that I was annoyed by a delay that occurred in one of the junior standards, and adds that I said that such a

32nd July, 1918.]

Mr. RICHARD QUINN examined.

[Continued.]

state of affairs should not exist in a school that calls itself —. I believe there was some delay, but I can neither recall what it was about, nor the incomplete statement which Mr. Quinn attributes to me on the occasion." (Of course, that is the omission of the word "good" in the print. Clearly he remembers that something occurred.)

20393. I notice your remark on the delay in forwarding the reports of inspectors from the Education Office?—The examination was held on the 6th of September, and I received the report the first week in December. It could not have left the office before the 30th November, as that is the date that is on the document.

20394. Is that long delay common—do it a common thing that a report is so long delayed?—It is not by any means common at all. I never knew it delayed for so long a time before. I have got them within a fortnight.

20395. Did you make any appeal or representation to the Board through your manager about this report?—I did not.

20396. Would you mind giving us the reason?—Well, I did not appeal for that reason. The manager, on getting the report, brought it to the school, and noticing what he considered a fall in the proficiency of the pupils rather gave me a tremendous query. He was displeased, and stated that I was in a nice corner. I said that there was no fall in the proficiency at the time, and that I was prepared to get the school re-examined, and he answered them, "Quiet means are the best," and I did not go further with it.

20397. Was he in the habit of being present at these examinations?—No, he was never present. And then I consulted with a friend of mine—well, with the Chairman of the Association, and took counsel with him, and he advised me not to appeal, that with a drop from "very good" to "good" I would hardly get a re-examination, and that I would not derive any benefit from the appeal, and I took his advice and did not go on. I should do it, though, through some other channel than the manager.

20398. Mr. CORRY.—The manager was quite friendly to you, but he was averse to making appeals?—He was very much so.

20399. And he would advise you, I take it, that the easy way, and the avoidance of any friction with the inspector, would be the wiser way in the end?—His answer was that everything would right itself in time. I am sorry to be talking this way now as he is dead. He was a very great personal friend of mine.

20400. The CHAIRMAN.—You did not sign this memorial?—Oh, I was not a representative teacher, not being a member of the Co. Tipperary Committee who were appointed to draw up the memorial. It is the secretaries of the local associations who form the County Committee.

20401. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—You have before you your own statement on page 205 of our last report?—Yes.

20402. And have you seen Mr. Welby's reply on page 211?—Yes, I have.

20403. Do you adhere to what you have stated on pages 206 and 207?—Yes, to every word, to every statement.

20404. In 1909, when Mr. Welby gave you "good" I think you said that it prevented you from getting an increment?—I was in the maximum of second grade and a "good" and two "very goods" are necessary (Mr. Dillworth said that) to get promotion to first grade, and Mr. Welby gave me two "goods," and I got then a "very good." The two "goods" deprived me of promotion.

20405. And you have not got that promotion?—I have never had it.

The BURNER or ROSS.—You are qualified now by this report. You have "good" and two "very goods."

20406. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Do you understand the rule in the way his lordship has put it, that you are now entitled to promotion?—Yes, I understand the rule thoroughly. "Very good," "good," "very good," or "good," "very good," "very good" will get it. Matters are all right with me at the present time.

20407. The CHAIRMAN.—You have not got it yet?—I have not got it yet.

20408. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Have you had any communication with the Board regarding it?—No.

20409. When did you receive the report "very good"?—I received the report "very good" on January 9th, 1913. I received it a fortnight or three weeks after the inspection.

20410. And you have had no communication from the Board since?—No.

20411. And you have made no communication to the Board?—No communication.

20412. And have not got your promotion?—No.

20413. So that officially you do not know whether you have got it or not?—I never heard anything about it one way or the other.

20414. Suppose you get it this year, and suppose that, as you think you ought to have got it in 1909, what would be the financial loss?—Oh, I would not be entitled to it in 1909, for that was the first year of the triennial period. On the 1st April, 1913, I got promotion to the maximum of second and then there were three years to go, so that 1910 was the first year of the triennial period, 1912 the second year, and 1911 the third year.

20415. The BURNER or ROSS.—And now you are entitled by your report of 1913, so you have lost one year?—I have lost one year.

20416. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—And you have no doubt that you will now get your promotion?—Well, my average is shaky now. It is going up and down. I want a 50 average. The average was down the first quarter of this year, and it was up in the second quarter.

20417. The CHAIRMAN.—How do the Board deal with the average in that case?—I do not know.

20418. The BURNER or ROSS.—How did your average work in 1912?—In 1912 the average was down.

20419. And you would have lost the promotion in any case in 1912 for want of average?—Yes, for want of average.

20420. Mr. HENLY.—But I suppose you would sooner lose it for want of average than for want of report?—I certainly would. I prefer to keep my reputation as a teacher.

20421. The CHAIRMAN.—What is your total salary now?—£125.

20422. Mr. HENLY.—Mr. Quinn, you stated in one of your replies that Mr. Welby examined geography in a way that you were not prepared for?—Yes; he did not ask for the progress record, and he questioned the children on a great deal of matter that they were not taught, and that Mr. Brown told us not to teach.

20423. But was it matter that they should have been taught?—No; it is contrary to the advice given in the Notes for Teachers issued from the office.

20424. Give us an example?—One struck me so much that I remember it. It was—"Give the chief towns of the Shetland Isles." Twenty chief towns of the British Isles is supposed to be sufficient according to the Notes for Teachers, and these must be important towns, such as Manchester, Liverpool, London, Aberdeen, Glasgow.

20425. And your complaint amounts to this, that while the Commissioners require those to be large towns like Dublin, he went into the minutiae of the old results system?—Yes, he conducted all the examinations in the old results style.

20426. Was your sixth class examined in arithmetic?—I am glad you have asked that question. The two pupils referred to were enrolled in 7th Standard at the time, but had got only four weeks' teaching in the 7th standard programme. Surely for examination purposes they must be regarded as 6th standard pupils, and Mr. Welby himself called them 6th standard pupils on the occasion. Through a mistake of mine they got a 7th standard test-card, and they failed.

20427. And he says—"Mr. Quinn very well knows that the answering of the pupils in geography was disappointing." What observation have you to make on that?—I remember Mr. Dardis visiting with Mr. Welby and asking a pupil to draw a map of Tipper-

ary and to mark the position of a few towns. The child was standing at the time and was given a pencil. The paper was on the table in front of Mr. Dardie, and the pupil had to sketch the map while in this position. That, so far as I remember, was the only examination in geography on that occasion. The visit was only an incidental one.

20418. You speak of being troubled in the presence of your pupils. What was the incident that led you to think that?—Is the first case, his remark that such a state of affairs should not exist in any school that calls itself good.

20419. Was that made loud enough to be heard by your pupils?—It could be heard outside the door (it was so loud) if the door were open.

20420. Under what circumstances was it made?—There was one very dull girl who did not go for a pencil and paper when ordered, and he ordered her again, but she remained standing looking at him, and this angered him so much that he turned towards the assistant, and the whole school heard him say:—“What kind of training does a child get in school who stands as she does without pencil or paper?”

20421. Are you right in your statement that he questioned the pupils about the time of the teachers' arrival at the school?—On the day after the examination I asked the pupils to write a letter (it is usual for me to do this after an examination), giving an account of the inspection that took place, and one girl wrote this:—“Mr. Welby arrived a very long time before the teachers, and he seemed to be very impatient, for he asked the pupils what time the teachers would arrive, and would they be long.” This is the form in which it was put. That letter is in Mr. Mansfield's possession and he can give it to you.

20422. Did you, after getting that letter, make any inquiry as to whether the question was addressed to the children?—I went immediately to the girl. There were very few present. This must have been twenty minutes before the time for opening the school in the morning. I went to the girl who wrote it, because I felt rather indignant that the pupils could think that inspectors had to watch me, and I asked the girl if she was sure about her statement, and she said:—“Yes, he asked me twice,” and the question he asked her was this:—“Are the teachers as late as this every morning?” leaving the girl under the impression that we were late, whereas I was there ten minutes before the time for opening the school.

20423. He says on page 212:—“Mr. Quinn is always in good time at the school. I pass it frequently and find (a good sign) many pupils there at 9 o'clock a.m.”?—That is quite true that they are there, and I am always in good time. Mr. Welby generally came in the morning half an hour or more than half an hour before the time given in the time table for the opening of the school.

20424. The CHAIRMAN.—How far has he to go?—Three miles to my school.

20425. Mr. HENRY.—He does not deny the fact that he might have spoken to the children, but he says that he does not recollect it, and then he says that probably he might have said something to Mr. Dardie?—It did not occur at all on the occasion that he mentions there. Mr. Dardie was not with him at all. It occurred on the occasion of the second general inspection, which was held on the 14/8/1911.

20426. Now, with reference to those entries in the register. What was the noting that he made the first time?—I have it here exactly:—“I notice that in former years several pupils have spent two years in their standards, and sometimes even three.”

20427. Was that noting accurate?—No. He saw it himself. I wrote to him.

20428. But I want an answer to the question:—Certainly, it was inaccurate.

20429. Had he taken any trouble to investigate the matter before he made that noting?—None whatever. He did not acquaint me with it.

20430. He did not ask you for an explanation?—He did not. I did not see the noting until he had left in the evening after the examination was over.

20431. You communicated with him about that visit?—I did.

20432. What was the nature of your communication?—I asked him to come immediately and cancel the statement before the manager would see his observation. He came about three weeks afterwards.

20433. And when he did come three afterwards what did he do?—He drew his pencil through it and wrote the word “cancelled” opposite it in pencil, but he made no observation afterwards in the book with reference to it.

20434. So it was a mere hasty note that he made on a simple glance at the register which led him to make that adverse noting?—Oh, well, I don't know that.

20435. Must it not have been that when he came and cancelled the noting afterwards?—It makes me feel that he was trying to discredit the other inspectors' reports.

20436. Well there is one question that I have asked all the teachers who have been witnesses, and I want to ask you that question now. Was there any falling-off or want of energy in your work in 1909 when the mark was lowered?—I am certain there was not.

20437. You were working as hard as in previous years?—Yes, and the proficiency was never higher, I believe.

20438. As far as you know, there was no falling-off in proficiency?—No, the proficiency was never higher. Six of the seven pupils “who had been enrolled in seventh standard for one year” were awarded certificates of merit in December three weeks after the receipt of the report on the general inspection. Four of the six, two boys and girls, obtained Technical Scholarships. The boys had to compete with over twenty others from different schools in South Riding. Of the ten winners my pupils were first and fifth.

20439. And then in 1912 the mark was raised to “very good” again?—Yes, by Miss Bourke.

20440. She is a junior inspector?—She is a junior inspector.

20441. And could not raise the mark without the concurrence of Mr. Welby?—Yes, that is the rule now.

20442. You say:—“The reports of the Science Organiser during the above years were ‘excellent.’” Have you these reports?—I have them here. They are only written in the observation book (observation book handed to Mr. Henly). The first report is just one word, “excellent,” and then in the column for suggestions, “No important suggestion necessary,” and that is signed “Emily S. Maguire.” In the next year she has:—“The general character of the work in the above subject continues to be ‘excellent.’”

The CHAIRMAN.—What is the subject?

20443. Mr. HENLY.—Science?—And object lessons.

20444. Now, what have you to say about Mr. Henly's manner?—Well, on one occasion, seeing a pupil being examined alone, a bit confused and distressed, I left my class and went to see what was wrong, and finding that she did not understand his question (and she was a very intelligent girl), I took the liberty of interfering and trying to explain how I taught the subject, so that he could examine accordingly, and he did not reply; he walked away from me. On another occasion I was discussing with him the question of having some lessons for the senior standards in the morning, and that I was very anxious to take that for twenty minutes, and I found it useful because parents like it, and after I gave my reasons he told me that I was pleasing long enough, that he went to school as well as I did. He would not sign the time table as I presented it. He treated us as people who should have no opinion at all on such matters.

20445. And did he discourage home lessons?—Oh, no, but he said any home lessons could be examined at the time the subject was taught.

20446. He did not object to home lessons in themselves, but to setting apart a certain time for taking

home lessons?—Yes, I found that very useful for the reason. Supposing I have a lesson in history, I might suggest to the children to supplement that by reading their history books at home, and I would examine it the next morning, and I think the proficiency in history would be much better if that were done. As a matter of fact, if the amount of history that I gave in the limit of half an hour on two days were all that the pupils were to get I am afraid that the progress in history would be very poor. And the same remark applies to geography. It would be a great loss to the children if home lessons were done away with, and the parents would not be pleased; they would send the children to another school.

20447. The BIRCH or ROSE.—You are in the diocese of Waterford?—Yes.

20448. Does the manager look after the repairs and equipment of your school?—That is a rather serious question. Do you wish me to answer it directly.

20449. Mr. HENLY.—If you prefer not to answer, perhaps his lordship would not press it?—I do not wish to have anything to say to the manager, but I may state with reference to it that I have lost myself a great deal over repairs and equipment.

20450. Mr. CORRY.—You suggest that Mr. Welpy's manner was not calculated to please children?—Yes, and that applies specially in the case that I mentioned of that little girl.

20451. I don't mean one particular child, but his manner in regard to the children in general. May we take it that you want to describe it as unsympathetic?—Oh, it was completely unsympathetic.

20452. He did not show any kindness towards the children?—Well, he did not encourage them. If they failed to answer, he would not put the question again in another form.

20453. The CHAIRMAN.—Give us that point that you said you wanted to bring before us, the point that Mr. Henly mentioned?—That is in reference to the cancellation. I never got an intimation yet from the office that the note in the observation book was cancelled. Another matter I should like to mention is that apart from delay in promotion my reputation as a teacher suffered in the eyes of my manager and others who knew of the lowering. Were I to apply for another school my chance of getting it would be very much less. Furthermore, I was deprived of the special promotion which, when a vacancy occurs, comes to those with 15 years' service, six consecutive "v.g.'s," and sufficient average.

20454. Your career was broken?—Yes.

20455. Mr. HENLY.—And you think some effort should be made to adjust the wrong that has been done to you?—Oh, certainly, I should like to have Mr. Welpy's reports cancelled and a statement to that effect sent to the manager, so that the people among whom and for whom I work may feel that my school deserved very good reports in 1909 and 1910, as well as in preceding and following years.

20456. The BIRCH or ROSE.—Do the people know generally about your report, the report that the school got?—They might not know the report, but owing to the observations of Mr. Welpy they believed there was something wrong and it was a subject of conversation among the children themselves and the people in the district.

Mr. PATRICK BARRY, Principal of Sliavardagh Boys' National School, County Tipperary, examined.

20457. The CHAIRMAN.—When were you appointed principal of Sliavardagh Boys' National School?—I would prefer that you should take Mr. Barry's case first.

20458. But I want to ask you something about your experience?—I have had 25 years' experience.

20459. As principal of Sliavardagh Boys' School?—16 as principal of Sliavardagh Boys' School and two years as pupil teacher in Waterford Model School and two years in training in Waterford.

20460. How long has Mr. Barry been in Sliavardagh Girls' School?—About seven years, I believe.

20461. Tell us the numbers of each school?—The average attendance of the girls' school would be, I suppose, at present in or about 55.

20462. And in your own school?—I suppose it would be a little more; it might be 57.

20463. And what is your grade under the new system?—I am in second division of first grade.

20464. And Mr. Barry?—She is only third.

20465. You are second of first. How long have you been that?—Since the 1st of September, 1912.

20466. Now, you wish to begin with Mr. Barry's case?—If you please. She says: "I always get most satisfactory reports till the advent of the senior inspector, Mr. Welpy. The reports will afford ample evidence."

20467. And then she gives an enumeration of the reports since 1904. In that year in Sliavardagh School Mr. Brown gave "good," her predecessor's report, by the same inspector, in 1908 having been "mildling." In 1905 in the same school Mr. Brown gave "very good" and there were complimentary remarks by the inspector, especially as to singing and needlework. She came to Sliavardagh, apparently, in 1908, and the school got from the same inspector "good" when six months there with very creditable and personal remarks both in respect and observation book. In 1907 Mr. McEnery gave her "very good" and in 1908 "very good" and in 1909 "very good" and Mr. Fitzpatrick in 1910 gave her "very good," with complimentary remarks, particularly as to singing and needlework. Then in 1911 the mark was reduced from "very good" to "fair" by Mr. Welpy?—Yes.

20468. And she says there were very damaging remarks in the report on almost all subjects. Have you that report here?—I have, sir.

20469. Will you let me have it?—(Witness hands in report.)

20470. We will take Mr. Fitzpatrick's report of 1910 first. In 1910 Mr. Fitzpatrick says:—"On the whole good progress as made in this school. The young pupils may, however, be trained to speak more fully at conversational lessons, and the studies to account fully for the working of arithmetic problems. Singing and needlework are well taught. Better ventilation is required. One window does not open. Some wall tablets and new map of the world are required." That was in 1910, and he gave "very good"?—Yes.

20471. Then this is Mr. Welpy's report in 1911, when he gave the mark "fair"?—"The teachers of this school must awake to the necessity for doing thorough rather than spurious work, the proficiency where tested showing serious defects. Reading is loud, but too quick, and often inaccurate. Drawing and needlework could be greatly improved. Penmanship is mediocre except in the highest standards. Grammar and composition proved backward in 3rd and 4th standards. Singing has scarcely been taught at all to the junior pupils. The infants should show evidence of much better teaching and training, and the proper form of a letter should be taught to the 5th standard children. A much more effective grouping of standards could be adopted with advantage." In January, 1912, Mr. P. J. Fitzgerald, who gave the mark "fair," made this report:—"This school has improved, but is not yet good. The methods of teaching arithmetic are not effective. The exercises in grammar are not well chosen, too much time being spent on merely mechanical work. The proficiency in analysis too is rather disappointing. There is evidence of teaching in the drawing exercises, but the preliminary exercises, which are essential to the acquisition of freedom of execution, do not receive sufficient attention, and the result is excessive rubbing. The training of the juniors has improved. First and second standards should, however, use a more advanced reader. The tone of the school is decidedly improved, and I see no reason why it should not recover its position in a short time. A larger number of promotions should have been made last July 1st. The remark in the observation book is that the tone of the school is good."

29th July, 1913.]

Mr. PATRICK BARRY examined.

[Continued.]

20472. Now we come to the last report, by Mr. D. P. Fitzgerald, who also gives the mark "false." That is three "false" in succession?—Yes.

20473. He says: "The school is in many respects in a satisfactory state, but a few defects take from its general character. The pupils did not show much intelligent acquaintance with arithmetic, and failed to apply readily the rules which they had learned. Lessons in history and geography should be made more interesting. An effort should be made to make the attendance of the pupils more regular. The offices should be kept cleaner." Then Mrs. Barry calls attention to the incidental visit of Mr. Welby on the 16th of June, 1910. She says: "He inspected senior pupils' written exercises. Very pleased with work. Took special note of nature study note books, and stated: 'I regret I cannot stay longer to see more of the pupils' work.'"

That was an incidental visit. Then with regard to his second visit on the 9th of March, 1911, she says: "Observed school work for about one hour. Then examined seniors in reading, subject matter, recitation, grammar (analysis and parsing); also juniors in reading and explanation, spelling and recitation. Wrote in observation book—(1) 'The teaching is clear and intelligent,' etc. (see observation book). Mr. Welby gave no credit for this when completing examination on the 27th March, 1911." So that this was only the first part of his regular examination?—Yes, he examined the principal subjects that day, and spent a longer time that day than the second day he examined.

20474. She says that on his third visit, on the 33rd of March, 1911, "Mr. Welby stated he came to examine candidate monitor. Gave no notice of his coming. Candidate absent. Mr. Welby seemed very much annoyed at disappointment. Mr. Welby went to boys' school and examined there." And then she calls attention to the visit of the 27th of March, 1911, and she says: "Visited with Miss Kelly and completed examination begun on 9/3/11. Frequently consulted note-book and asked teachers if such a subject was examined previously—to show that he meant the visit of 9/3/11 as examination. (Now see observation book for contradictory statement)?"—Yes, that is so.

20475. Now, I want to see the contradictory statements in the observation book?—(Witness hands book to Chairman).

20476. "On the 9th of March, incidental visit, 37 present. See teaching is clear and intelligent, most attention being paid to oral composition."—He spent, I believe, about 2½ hours in the school on that occasion.

20477. On the inspection of the 27th of March he wrote:—(1) Reading too quick, and it is often inaccurate. (2) Needlework requires much more attention. It is of very poor quality in I. and II. standards, and only fair in V. and VI. (3) Closely dotted copies are not to be used in drawing. Plain copies are to be used in standards above I. Drawing is poor in I., II., III., and IV. standards. (4) Keep a suitable map pointer. (5) Much more can be done in junior singing. (6) The room is overcrowded. Discipline could be better maintained in spite of this. (7) My opinion is that the teaching, which appears so vigorous at an incidental visit, is not sustained, and I find a general lack of thoroughness in the teaching where it came to be tested." That is the contradiction?—Yes.

20478. The most important subjects were already tested?—Yes.

20479. That is your point. He tests the first visit only as incidental, but you say it was longer than the second?—Yes, and it was a more important examination.

20480. Mr. CHURCH.—On the 9th of March Mr. Welby's noting in the observation book is that the teaching is clear and intelligent. Is not that so?—That is so.

20481. And on the 27th of March he reports that the teaching did not appear to be thorough?—Yes, and that the teaching which appeared so vigorous at an incidental visit was not sustained where it came to be tested, and showed a general lack of thoroughness.

20482. The CHAIRMAN.—Mrs. Barry says the principal day of examination was the 9th and not the 27th. She

says: "Mr. Welby was most rude in manner to assist and myself."—He avoids this visit altogether in the blue book in reference to Mrs. Barry, and he says the third visit to that school was on the 23rd of the 3rd month.

20483. Now give us examples, as you promised?—Examples of discourtesy?—Yes.

20484. Yes!—He ordered the assistant to give an object lesson, and kept up continuous shouting to keep the babies quiet, particularly one baby who had made about three weeks' attendance. He drew attention to an imbecile in a very rough tone of voice when she was not attending to the object lesson. "While I was engaged," says Mrs. Barry, "in marking errors in dictation he ordered my standards to get ready for needlework, and ordered the needlework to go on. He pronounced arithmetic bad in the second standard, and scolded. 'Bad as it is, it is better than in the boys' school.'"

20485. Was that said aloud?—Yes, in a loud tone of voice. All the school heard that. And then she says he requested the juniors to sing. He would not allow the third standard to join the juniors, as was customary. She said there were very few singers in the juniors, they had not very good voices, and he said: "Nonsense! all children can sing." This remark was also quite audible. Then he said: "We don't want to have that kept up all day." The seniors at that time were going through a round from the music chart. He next called her attention to the observation book, and she asked him in what respect was the reading faulty; he replied, "They slide over the words rather than halt." He next threw back the specimens of needlework to her most rudely.

20486. Now about want of sympathy towards pupils and teachers. She refers to infants being required to keep still though unoccupied; his calling particular attention to the drawing of an imbecile. You have had all that, and also as to Mr. Fitzgerald's contradictory statements?—Yes. Mr. Fitzgerald's is a very remarkable statement, because he wrote that after the examination. He stated first in the observation book that the reading of the 5th and 6th standard pupils was clear and on the whole intelligent. He wrote in about a week afterwards from Channel saying, "Your standard for 'good' and 'very good,' etc., is very different from mine. I would not consider that reading in the present 5th and 6th standards is good even now," although he had referred to it in the observation book as being "good."

20487. And he also stated that the tone of the school was "good"?—Yes.

20488. And that the school was neatly kept?—Yes.

20489. And yet the merit mark remained "fair"?—Yes.

20490. Now, Mrs. Barry appealed?—Yes.

20491. Through her manager?—Well, she appealed directly first. She waited for the return of the report before taking any steps.

20492. When was this examination held that she appealed against?—On the 15th and 16th of January.

20493. When was the report sent down to her?—At the end of March. There is no date on it.

20494. When did she appeal?—Immediately after receiving the report.

20495. What was the reply?—"Letter returned herewith. Should be forwarded to this office through the manager."

20496. I ask you why it did not go through the manager, as you know it is a violation of the rule to send it directly?—It is, but we were not aware of that. We thought if you had any grievance against an inspector you could write direct.

20497. The BASTON or ROSS.—What did you do when you got that note from the office?—I went to the manager, and we appealed again, and then this is the reply:—

"Office of National Education, Dublin, 15th June, 1912. Rev. Sir,—With reference to your letter of the 24th of April appealing against the merit mark assigned to the above-named school at the last inspection and requesting a re-examination of the school, I am directed by the Commissioners of National Education to inform you that,

29th July, 1918.]

Mr. PATRICK BARRY examined.

[Continued.]

having had before them a special report of their inspector and having consulted the Chief Inspector, who visited the school in November last, they see no reason for ordering a re-examination of the school.—I am, Rev. Sir, your obedient servant, W. J. DILLWORTH, Secretary.

"To Very Rev. J. Hickey, P.P., Ballingarry, Killenalea."

There was no special visit in that month. Mr. Hynes would have raised her report to "good."

20098. The Chief Inspector was there the previous November?—Yes.

20099. And evidently he had formed some opinion about the school the previous November?—Yes.

20100. What they mean to convey is that the Chief Inspector formed an opinion of the school in November and that his opinion coincided with the opinion of the Inspector in March?—Oh, it does not mean that surely, since Mr. Hynes raised the report.

20101. The CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Hynes came down on a mission from the National Board to visit fourteen schools, and Mrs. Barry's was one of those fourteen?—Yes.

20102. And he formed, as his lordship says, an opinion of that school which he expressed in the report, and when the Board referred to him for his opinion he simply gave the opinion he had formed in November?—His report appears in the Blue Book.

20103. There he called it "good (weak)"?—Yes, that is different from "fair."

20104. The previous mark was "fair"; but there was no special visit at all of the district inspector in the meantime?—It is stated there that there was a special report, "having had before them a special report of their inspector."

20105. The BISHOP or BROS.—But it did not necessitate a visit that the inspector should make a special report?—My point, my lord, is that there was neither a special report nor a special visit and hence the futility of appeals.

20106. The CHAIRMAN.—The report is sent down to the Inspector for his further observations, but he is not required necessarily to go and revisit the school. He is required to make further observations and give more detailed information as to why he arrived at the conclusion he had arrived at, and they evidently asked Mr. Hynes for his opinion, what he thought of the school?—This is Mr. Hynes' opinion of the school, she says?—Mr. Hynes remained about an hour. Inspected most of the subjects of the school programme. Seemed much pleased with all. He remarked, "Your reading must have improved very much since Mr. Welply's time." I asked his opinion of the school. He stated, "With attention to a few details I cannot see why your school should not arrive at perfection at an early date." That is Mr. Hynes' opinion of the school.

20107. The BISHOP or BROS.—Those are the statements he made to the teacher?—Yes, to the two teachers.

20108. The CHAIRMAN.—Yes, she says, "Mr. Welply, Mr. P. J. Fitzgerald, and Mr. P. D. Fitzgerald have, among other remarks stated:—'Teaching clear and intelligent,' 'Tone good,' 'Teachers work industriously,' 'Order good,' 'Pupils work industriously,' 'Promises met,' 'Room nicely kept'; and both district inspectors state that the school is increasing in efficiency, and yet they agree with their Senior's mark, and cobbler or laundry have always been taught, and with success." Now as to Dr. Starke's visit, he remained in Mrs. Barry's school about half an hour?—Half an hour.

20109. Were you present?—He was in my school, too.

20110. She says, "He looked at drawing and composition exercises and needlework. Got pupils to read, and stated 'Your reading is good.'" He said that to Mrs. Barry?—He did.

20111. Did Mr. Dillworth say anything?—Yes, Mr. Dillworth also said it was good or very good, and I think Mrs. Starke remarked, "the reading is splendid."

20112. Then you come to the visit of Mr. Hynes?—Yes.

20113. And he praised the reading and said it must have improved very much since Mr. Welply's time?—Yes.

20114. And his opinion of the school was, "With attention to a few details I cannot see why your school should not arrive at perfection at an early date"?—Perfection again?—were the words he used.

20115. And you complain that after giving all this praise he only gave a "weak good"?—Quite so.

The CHAIRMAN.—And then Mrs. Barry remarks on Mr. Welply's manner again. Now I think we had better go over your own case.

20116. Mr. COFFEY.—I suppose nothing except the assumption that there was an entirely different standard applied by Mr. Welply is the explanation of the lowering of this long succession of "very goods" in Mrs. Barry's school to "fair"?—Indeed I can see no reason whatsoever for the lowering except a caprice of his own.

20117. There is a reduction of two points?—Yes. What he says is, "I arrived with Miss Kelly, whom I took into the girls' school. I asked her to watch the teaching for an hour and to make notes, but not to interfere in any way. At 12.10 precisely I returned from the boys' school and asked Miss Kelly quietly what she thought of this school, and her reply was remarkable. She said, 'I have looked at the observation book and I find that the school has been getting 'very good,' but I would not give it more than 'fair.'"

20118. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Where does that appear?—He states that in the Blue Book at page 218, and it is surprising that the opinion of Miss Kelly, who was only a junior inspector, should predominate over the opinions of three previous inspectors of long experience as well as over Mr. Welply's own judgment that "The teaching was clear and intelligent."

20119. Mr. COFFEY.—That was in 1911?—Yes.

20120. Miss Kelly could not have been long an inspector at that time?—Mr. Welply said that her reply was remarkable that she would not give it more than "fair."

20121.2. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, in your own case you make some remarks on the inspection system. You say, "Only one occasion did Mr. Welply offer any form of salute when entering or leaving this school. I regret to state that Mr. P. J. Fitzgerald acted somewhat similarly on succeeding Mr. Welply, though some years ago Mr. Fitzgerald visited here and was most courteous and agreeable."—Yes, that is so. On the first visit he paid me after Mr. Welply he did not really salute me.

20122. Does he walk in without any notice?—It was in the play time, and knowing he was in the girls' school I waited for him.

20123. He walked in, and what did he do?—He just looked towards me and he said, "I see that you have some papers on the floor." Of course, there were, because since those letters came into use the little ones drop a lot of the papers.

20124. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—What is a jottor?—A scribbler.

20125.7. What is a scribbler?—

Mr. HENRY.—A piece of paper that they hold instead of a slate?—The little infants often let these fall on the floor.

20126. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—And this was at the close of the day?—It was at the play time.

20127. At the close of the morning session?—Yes.

20128. The CHAIRMAN.—Then you go on to say that Mr. Welply questioned the monitor very minutely respecting the teachers' hours of attendance in the morning?—Yes.

20129. And you say that he entered in a very stealthy manner?—Yes.

20130. He denies that, and he says that he did not?—He happened to walk in behind both of us, and he was there at the book, and when half of my children were standing up looking towards him and the others looking towards me I did not know what was

20th July, 1918.]

Mr. PATRICK BARRY examined.

[Continued.]

on at the time until I saw Mr. Welpy at work at the books. He generally left his motor car at some distance and walked into the school. There was no reason to suspect us of anything, and there was no falsification of accounts at any time in either school.

20582. Mr. COFFERT.—Would the people in the district know that, when he had left his motor car some distance away?—It was strange that he should leave it so far away and walk down to the school.

20583. Would the people about the place know that?—The people of the village could notice that, because all other motor men who visited left their motor cars opposite the school and near the school.

20585. The CHAIRMAN.—Go on to the defective method of inspection. You say, "Mr. Welpy carries on his work exactly in the old results style and examines pupils individually, and he gives no notice of such examination?"—No notice ever.

20586. Is notice sent to the manager on the morning of the day of inspection?—Yes, I understand that that is so.

20587. The manager, you say, never was present?—Well, the manager was present on some occasions.

20588. "And there is no allowance for irregular or dull pupils," that is pupils who attend irregularly?—Yes, that is so.

20589. He never consults the teacher, he has no conversation with you?—No, he does not want to talk to the teacher.

20590. You say that he does not notice the record of progress at all?—I do not think that he does.

20591. Does he examine irrespective of that?—Oh, yes, he examines irrespective of it.

20592. The BRISOR or ROSS.—Does he make any inquiry as to what the pupils have learned?—No, he never did.

20593. So that he has not their record?—No.

20594. The CHAIRMAN.—And your fourth point is that he rushes the examination. Do you mean that he hurries the pupils?—Yes; that is the most defective part of his method to my mind.

20595. I suppose he had to get through a great deal in the day?—Well, he used in a really unsatisfactory style.

20596. And then he shows want of sympathy with the children, you say. In what way?—In his manner. To a little infant passing he would shout roughly at the child, "Sit down."

20597. And then you object to the hour of his visit, a quarter to nine in the morning?—Yes, nine o'clock is my time.

20598. And then you say also at five minutes to three?—Well, that should be ten minutes to three.

20599. About the time the school would break up?—Yes; at that time we had religious instruction from three to half-past three.

20600. So that he would only have ten minutes for real inspection of the school?—Yes, that is so. We had no religious instruction that evening. He kept on till five minutes past four.

20601. He examined 5th and 6th standards in arithmetic, four dictated problems, and composition during this visit?—Yes.

20602. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Did I understand you to say that the closing hour of the school was three o'clock?—For secular instruction.

20603. And you did not ordinarily give any secular instruction after three o'clock?—Oh, no.

20604. And Mr. Welpy knew that?—Well, he could see that in the time table.

20605. And he went on to 4?—Yes.

20606. And were the pupils kept there all that time?—Oh, yes.

Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—That is a very serious matter for children who had gone at an early hour of the day.

Mr. HENRY.—Of course it is.

20607. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Could you expect children at that hour to acquit themselves properly?—They are very worried. At that time they have very little energy.

20608. The CHAIRMAN.—You say that during the last portion of the examination he kept shouting out,

"Half time," "Ten minutes more," "Five minutes to go."—"I'll not remain a minute after 4 o'clock"—Yes, that is so.

20609. He actually used those expressions?—Every word that I have here, because the assistant as well as the monitor could prove that. I have not the assistant now, he has left the school since.

20610. And you say the greater portion of his time is taken up with jotting down in a notebook, but you recognise that he must make notes?—Yes, certainly, if they were of a proper kind.

20611. And copy them, too?—If they were of a proper kind.

20612. You say that he writes too much of these in the observation book?—Oh, yes, and more of the things are entirely incorrect. He said, "The infants are not receiving adequate attention. The oldest of them make no attempt at easy arithmetic." I never had an infant class that I had not the senior portion of them as well as the lower part of the first class. In other words, I never had an infant class that were not able to do simple arithmetic. "Notes for history," he says, "should be made out." I keep notes for history the same as for every other subject.

20613. You say some of his notes in the observation book are most contradictory, while some are rather unreasonable?—He had, "Always have a dozen map pointers in the school." I asked for the reason of the reduction of the merit mark. Mr. Welpy said it was the assistant's fault, owing to the state of arithmetic in standard 2. My personal mark he said was "very good," and when I laboured this point Mr. Welpy seemed very much annoyed. I simply required to know why my personal mark, "very good," and the assistant's "good," could not make the general mark "very good."

20614. That your merit mark ought to be given as the merit mark of the school?—Yes, that is so.

20615. And that the assistant's mark should not count?—Yes, I mean that I had a right to have the general report of the school "very good" as I had "very good" myself. He said that my report was "very good," while that of the assistant was "good."

The CHAIRMAN.—But we have had it in evidence again and again that the bad mark of an assistant does, as a matter of fact, pull down a school.

20616. The BRISOR or ROSS.—You see it is a report on the school, and the proficiency of the school as a whole is determined by the proficiency of all the teachers, if there were 20 teachers there?—There were only two there, and I think that I as principal were entitled to the benefit of the doubt.

The BRISOR or ROSS.—The personal merit mark is based on the work of each individual teacher, but when you are dealing with the report on the school, supposing there is one good principal and there are 20 bad assistants, how could you report the school as "good?"

20617. Mr. HENRY.—The principal got "very good" and the assistant got "good," and it is the assistant's mark that ruled the school?—That is my point.

20618. And, therefore, you think that as you were the principal it was right that your mark should rule the school rather than that the assistant's mark should rule the school?—Yes.

20619. The CHAIRMAN.—You say that when you laboured this point Mr. Welpy replied, "You see, these are the rules of the Board," and then you say, "I politely told Mr. Welpy that I had not seen these rules, and neither have I yet seen them. Mr. Welpy turned his back to me abruptly." Did he leave the school there and then?—Yes, and the argument between Mr. Welpy and myself continued as far as the door of the girls' school. It lasted quite twenty minutes. It is quite incorrect to state, as he does in the Kine Book, that I felt satisfied with his award. He says I was satisfied with the merit mark I got. That stung me very much. He knew very well that I was not satisfied.

20620. Now we come to the reports of the school by which you wish to show the high character is had before. You speak of the successes of pupils at King's Scholarships examinations at the local colleges of Redwell and Thurles?—Yes.

20371. Then there are four previous reports on your school. They are all "very good" down to 1910, very satisfactory and complimentary reports, and then there is a break in 1911, and you are reduced to "good" by Mr. Welply, who describes the school as not very satisfactory.—Yes.

20372. Now, will you give me that report of Mr. Welply?—(Witness hands in Report.)

20373. On the 10th of June, 1910, Mr. Fitzpatrick gave the school "very good," and says, "Both staff and pupils work with zeal and industry, and as a result very satisfactory progress is made. The answering was intelligent and showed considerable readiness. The house and premises are kept with fair taste." On the 3rd and 27th of March, 1911, Mr. Welply gave the mark "good," and he wrote, "The condition of this school is not so meritorious as it seems to have been in previous years, and though the proficiency has good features there are also grave defects. The infants have not been adequately trained and taught. Arithmetic proved backward in 2nd, 3rd, and 4th standards, drawing in the highest group, and no record of practical work in science has been kept since 10th June, 1910. A more deliberate and expressive style of reading should be inculcated, and more attention should be given to analysis and geography in the third standard. A new globe is required." Then in 1912 Mr. P. J. Fitzgerald, who inspected on the 25th and 26th of January, gave "good," and he says in his report, "The teachers are evidently zealous, and their work merits the award 'good.' Improvement could easily be effected in written English of infants and 1st standard, and in arithmetic of 3rd and 4th standards. A class room would be a great acquisition here, but pending the provision of one step should be taken to prevent unnecessary talking. The appearance of the school room would be improved by the provision of a few pictures." And now this is the last report, the report of the 7th of May last, from Mr. Nicholas!—Yes.

20374. He gave you "good" again!—Yes.

20375. And in his report he says, "Considering the rather crowded room in which both teachers have to conduct their work the proficiency attained in this school is satisfactory. The work of the 3rd and 4th standards is, except in the case of arithmetic, distinctly good, but the principal has not met with the same success in the higher standards of his division. On the whole, suitable provision is being made for the infants, but the time table for those young children needs some revision." This is the last report!—Yes.

20376. What is your grade now?—Second division of first.

20377. When did you get that?—The 1st of September, 1910. It was owing to me on the 1st of April, 1900. I had paper promotion during the interval.

20378. For one year?—One year and five months.

20379. And then this marking of Mr. Welply and Mr. Fitzgerald and Mr. Nicholas deprived you of the chance of further promotion?—Well, of course, they would to a certain extent.

20380. When could you get promotion to the first of first grade?—Well, I was under the impression that three "very goods" were necessary, but now it appears from evidence that three "goods" would be sufficient to obtain the increment in that grade.

20381. So you may get your increment?—I may get the increment. I was on paper promotion from the 1st of April, 1909, till the 1st of September, 1910, a year and five months, which at £30 a year would represent the loss of £14 3s. 4d. This arrangement (bad in other respects, too) caused an additional loss in increment from 1st April, 1912, to 1st July, 1913, being equal to one year and three months equal £12 10s., making a total loss of £26 13s. 4d.

20382. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—I think it is desirable that there should be nothing put down in the

way of loss which is not strictly accurate. Do you want to modify that?—It should be more than what is stated there. The whole sum is £27 10s. on the 1st of this month.

20383. Does that mean that you should have received substantial promotion at the time you received paper promotion?—Yes, that is so.

20384. So that you are speaking now against the rule of paper promotion?—Yes, that is so.

20385. And does the whole of this loss accrue through that?—It does, yes. I thought that those three "goods" would not do.

20386. Have you any alteration to make in consequence of that?—Well, I really have not. The full sum that I am at the loss of owing to that paper promotion system is £27 10s. during the interval. That is the amount up to the present.

20387. I understand you to say that you have lost a year and five months' increment in consequence of the paper promotion, at £10 a year?—Yes.

20388. In consequence of the promotion being paper promotion and not substantial promotion?—Yes.

20389. But have you lost anything else?—Well, in 1912 I should have got the increment then to that grade from the 1st of April, 1912. The increment in that grade would be owing to me were I promoted in the proper time.

20390. But the whole of this loss accrues from the promotion being paper promotion and not substantial promotion?—Yes, that is so.

20391. Does increment in the second of first count from the date of substantial promotion or from the date of paper promotion?—Evidently from substantial promotion and not paper promotion.

20392. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, the fourth subject you deal with is the reprimand. You say, "Mr. Welply incorrectly reported to the Board on 4th October, 1911, that I had not a sufficient amount of work done in elementary science. In the school at the above date, when Mr. Welply was about forming an adverse opinion, I came up and pointed out his mistake and showed him the old and new exercises of pupils and the amount of work. Oh, yes," said Mr. Welply, "I see, that's all right." Yet I have been reprimanded, and most unjustly."—I have.

20393. This reprimand is dated the 8th of November, 1911. It is addressed to the manager, and is as follows:—

"Rev. Sir,—I am directed by the Commissioners of National Education to call your attention to the unsatisfactory teaching of elementary science in the above named school. The Senior Inspector states as follows in his report of a visit to the school on 4th ultimo:—'No exercises appear in elementary science since June. The principal told me the pupils did practical work and wrote accounts of this in their scribbles. This is not satisfactory, because separate science exercise books are kept. The school has been in operation five weeks since June.'—I am, Rev. Sir, your obedient servant, W. J. DUNN, Secretary. To Very Rev. J. Hickey, P.P., B.F., Ballingarry."

Is that actually a reprimand?—Well, I don't know really. I never got anything like that before.

20394. The general wording in the case of a reprimand is, "You are requested to reprimand the teacher," so this is not a reprimand?—I do not know, for I never got one.

20395. Mr. CORRY.—Are you quite clear that there is no mistake as to Mr. P. J. Fitzgerald in going into the school without saluting you, for he is a very courteous and common-sense man—are you clear about it?—I am perfectly clear on the point. Of course, the influence of Mr. Welply was evident in that case. As I have stated, I do believe that Mr. Fitzgerald had to go according to orders. I do think he sympathized with us at heart, but had to agree with Mr. Welply.

Mr. PATRICK LEARY, Principal of Glenties National School, Tipperary, examined.

20396. The CHAIRMAN.—You are principal of Glenties School, County Tipperary?—Yes.

20397. When were you appointed?—I was appointed in November, 1904, that is twelve years ago.

20398. What is your grade now?—Second grade. I have just reached second grade.

20399. Now, you have a statement with regard to your losses through abolition of classification in 1909,

20th July, 1913.]

MR. PATRICK LEAHY EXAMINED.

[Continued.]

the improper fixing of salary and increments, the lowering of your school report because of the work of a junior assistant mistress, and your loss of special promotion?—Yes.

I.—Losses through abolition of Classification in 1900, are as follows:—(a) Promotion to 2nd Division of 1st Class on completion of two years' highly efficient service. (b) Promotion to 1st Division of 1st Class on completion of additional five years' highly efficient service.

II.—Improper fixing of Salary and Increments.—(a) Acted as Temporary Principal of Monamohill N.S., January, 1900, to September, 1900. Then acted as substitute for principal and was appointed to Glenbane in November, 1901. (b) Income for my work in large school (Glenbane, average 60) determined on average results' fees earned by another teacher in small school (Monamohill, average 30). The average results earned in this school were only £18 4s. 6d.; whereas the average fees of similar schools throughout Ireland were £18 14s. 7d. (see Commissioners' Report, 1904, page 17). This difference of £5 10s. in initial salary means a net loss to date of £75. (c) Had Glenbane been my first appointment, my initial salary would have been £79, and present salary, £107; whereas my initial salary was fixed at £66 and my present salary, after twelve years' very efficient service, is £87. (d) At end of triennial period (June, 1907), I got a partial increment of £4. I requested the Commissioners to use their power under Rule 185 (a) and grant me, as they did others, Special Promotion to Second Grade at same time. Though entitled by reports and service to this special promotion (see Appendix, Report of Commission, page 182), I was kept for a further period of 3 years and 10 months on maximum of Third Grade. Appeal was fruitless.

III.—Lowering of my school report on two occasions, (January, 1908, and November, 1909) because of work of junior assistant mistress.—(a) There was no suggestion of negligence on my part on either occasion when report was lowered. (b) At annual inspection, January, 1907, through usual promotions had been made on first day of same month, the inspector suggested that the best children be again promoted July, 1907. I agreed and carried out suggestion (see Roll Book); yet at annual inspection, January, 1908, when lowering report the inspector gave no special consideration for these exceptional circumstances. (c) My report is again lowered in November, 1909, through my work is "very good," and tone of school "very good," the Circular to Tons had not then been issued. This report is a direct contradiction to the answer to question 2014 vol. of Evidence. (d) This Junior Assistant Mistress was appointed July 1st, 1908, and was reported as:—(1) Efficient in autumn of 1900 (Mr. McEnery). (2) Efficient in January, 1907 (Mr. McEnery). (3) Efficient at Easter Examination, 1907. (4) Efficient in January, 1908 (Mr. McEnery). (5) Efficient in December, 1908 (Mr. Brown). (6) Efficient in November, 1909 (Mr. Welby). (7) Efficient in October, 1910 (Mr. Fitzpatrick). (8) Efficient in October, 1911 (Mr. Fitzgerald). (9) Efficient in September, 1912 (Mr. Fitzgerald). (10) Efficient in March, 1913 (Mr. Welby). These ten reports given in seven years by five inspectors show she is efficient eight times and inefficient twice. On each occasion, when inefficient, my report is lowered and promotion delayed.

IV.—Loss of Special Promotion in consequence of above reduction of marks.—(a) Would have been entitled to Special Promotion if report, January, 1908, had not been lowered. (b) Lowering of report, November, 1909, kept me for a period of three years and 10 months on maximum of 3rd Grade.

20100. Now, you give a number of reports on your school?—Yes; I have made out this statement:—

Year.	Report.	Inspector.	Inspector's Observations on Report	Salary.
Jan., 1902	Fair ..	Mr. Brown ..	None. [Examination in January, appointed Nov., 1901.—P.L.]	58
Jan., 1903	Good ..	Mr. McEnery	None.	60
Jan., 1904	Good ..	Mr. McEnery	This School is doing good and useful work, and creditable progress is shown in most branches of the curriculum.	63
Jan., 1905	Good ..	Mr. McEnery	The teaching—especially that of the Principal—is skilful and effective; and good progress is shown in almost all branches of the school programme.	73
Jan., 1906	Very Good	Mr. McEnery	Very creditable progress is exhibited in the various branches of school work, and the teaching generally is skilful and effective. The pupils are under excellent discipline and show much interest in their studies.	73
Jan., 1907	Very Good	Mr. McEnery	The general work of this school continues to be performed in a skilful and successful manner, as the proficiency exhibited in most branches attests.	78
Jan., 1908	Good ..	Mr. McEnery	The instruction of the Principal teacher is on sound and intelligent lines and is generally successful. [NOTE: Report apparently lowered on J.A.M.'s work. No special consideration given though pupils had been twice (January and July) promoted during year.—P.L.]	77
Dec., 1908	Very Good	Mr. Brown ..	Work is carried on with energy and is effective. The pupils have been intelligently taught and their progress in the current school year has been very good.	77
Nov., 1909	Good ..	Mr. Welby	The Principal is a capable and efficient teacher, and so far as his work goes, the general result has been Very Good. The Tone of the School is Very Good. At incidental visit (15th October 1909), Mr. Welby writes in Observation Book:—“(1) The Senior Exercises, drawings, &c., are of good quality, and I am glad to note evidences of careful preparation for work on Mr. Leahy's part.” And on the 2nd November he writes:—“Mr. Leahy's work is well done.” [Yet he reduces the mark.—P.L.]	77

1904 July, 1913.]

Mr. PATRICK LEAHY examined.

[Continued.]

Year.	Report.	Inspector.	Inspector's Observations on Report.	Salary.
Oct., 1910	Very Good	Mr. Fitzpatrick	Work is carried on here with much earnestness on the part of both pupils and teachers, and as a result the progress made is very satisfactory. The general answering was intelligent. Written exercises are done with care and show steady progress.	£ 77
Oct., 1911	Very Good	Mr. Fitzgerald	The Principal of this school is a very capable teacher. The tone of the school is admirable. The pupils speak with confidence and distinctness and show that their intelligence is successfully developed. With improvement in the Junior portion of the school the standard of Excellent would be reached.	87
Sept., 1912	Very Good	Mr. Fitzgerald	The School is in a very efficient state. Reading and oral English of Standards III. to VI. is much above the average. The written exercises are distinctly creditable. The teaching generally aims at and succeeds in developing the intelligence of the pupils. If the wood-work were painted, the school would be a model of taste and neatness.	87
		Mr. Weply	From Observation Book:—"All Mr. Leahy's work is characterised by intelligence and a love of his work." Incidental Visit. From Observation Book:—"I am greatly pleased with condition of this School." (March 19th, 1913).	

20601. Mr. HENRY.—That is your statement?—That is my statement, sir. That incidental visit of Mr. Weply's was for the purpose of testing my school for the Carls and Blake premium. He told me I had some chance of it, but there is no announcement made of it so far, though it is six months beyond the usual time.

20602. Now, did you lose anything or was increment delayed by Mr. Weply's lowering of the mark in any way?—Do you mean in 1909.

20603. Yes—I would have been entitled to promotion from the list of April, 1910, if that report had not been lowered. My promotion was delayed till 1911.

20604. This is the letter from the Commissioners:—"I am directed to inform you that the Commissioners of National Education having fully considered the report on the services of Mr. Patrick Leahy . . . are pleased to order that he be promoted to the second grade of National teachers from the list of April, 1911?"—Yes.

20605. Mr. COFFEY.—You would have been promoted previously had not for the lowering of the mark?—Yes, in 1910.

20606. The BRISOR or ROSS.—Your report was lowered in 1908?—Yes.

20607. By Mr. McENERY?—Yes.

20608. And apparently the work of your junior assistant was not satisfactory?—Yes, I have the full report here.

20609. Mr. HENRY.—That was in January, 1908?—Yes. He says, "The instruction of the principal teacher is on sound and intelligent lines and is generally successful. The work of the junior assistant, however, is of but average merit. Her lessons lack energy and animation." In that year we had promoted the children on two occasions. The school year was changed to a common school year for all Ireland from the 1st of July, 1906, but teachers got some time to conform to the new ideas. The Board's circular suggested in my case that I should keep the children 15 months in each standard so that at the end of the second period of 15 months I would come in on the common school year. Instead Mr. McENERY suggested to me that some of my children appeared to be so good and so intelligent that it would be a pity for them to lose six months and that he would make special consideration in his inspection if I gave those children two promotions in the year and gave them the advantage of six months rather than have them lose six months. I agreed with Mr. McENERY, and I gave two promotions, and my judgment was afterwards justified, because those children did remarkably well since.

20610. The BRISOR or ROSS.—Though that suggestion had been made by Mr. McENERY, when the examination came you were reduced from "very good" to "good"?—Yes, and when I reminded him that he had promised special consideration, his reply was that if I did not consider the children good enough I should not have given them the second promotion, if they were good enough for the second promotion they should show the usual progress of children who had spent a year in each standard.

Mr. HENRY.—The report for 1909 says, "The principal is a capable and efficient teacher, and so far as his work goes the general result is very good. The junior assistant mistress, however—"

20611. Mr. COFFEY.—How long is the new school-house built?—Since 1897.

20612. Mr. HENRY.—Had you any voice in the appointment of the junior assistant mistress?—None whatever.

20613. Was she there before you?—No, and I never saw her till she came and told me she had been appointed junior assistant mistress.

20614. And then your promotion depended on the mark of the school?—Yes.

20615. And the mark of the school depended partly on you and partly on the assistant?—Yes.

20616. And as she was not up to the same standard as yourself the school mark was pulled down in consequence?—Yes, on two occasions, and I suffered by it. I lost special promotion. If that mark had been "very good" in 1908 I would have been entitled to special promotion at that date. What I consider a very great grievance is the unfair fixing of my initial salary.

20617. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Did I understand that you complain with regard to the fixing of your initial salary, that your initial salary was fixed upon the average of the three years ending with 1890 instead of being fixed on the income in the highest school during that time?—Quite so. My appointment to the small school was only a temporary one while the teacher was away, and it would have been better for me if I had never been there; I would have started with £70, and there is an estimate there showing that my loss by being eight months in that school is £211.

20618. And you say that had you refused that school you would have been better off by £211?—Yes.

20619. The BRISOR or ROSS.—I do not quite see how you had a vested interest?—I was trained in 1890 to 1898.

20620. Where were you then from that?—I left training in 1898; I acted as substitute for an assistant.

20th July, 1918.]

20630. Mr. HENRY.—What was your status when leaving training?—I passed with 71 per cent., gaining "Special Distinction." That entitled me to second division of first class after two years' service without examination.

20631. Yes, but, of course, you should have been teaching during the time?—Yes.

20632. Were you teaching at all between those periods?—Only as a substitute till 1900.

20633. In more schools than one?—Well, only in one school before 1900.

20634. And then you went as principal to Monmouth?—Yes, on the 1st of January, 1900.

20635. So that you had no permanent appointment either as assistant or principal before the change on the 1st of April, 1900?—No, though principal, my appointment was temporary.

20636. Sir HENRY WATKINS.—What would have been the effect on your salary if you had entered as a junior teacher immediately after the new system came into operation?—According to the special consideration promised.

20637. You could not have any special consideration if you had no service before the new system came into operation?—You mean if I had not had training before 1900?

20638. No; it is not a question of training, but if you had not had a post as teacher in 1900?—My case should have been specially considered upon my appointment, even though I had no service. I was an existing teacher, and even teachers in training during that year, 1900, were existing teachers; and there was a clause put into the rules at the time saying that special consideration would be granted in the fixing of their incomes.

20639. In the absence of special consideration, what would have been your salary and increment?—My salary would be £52 10s., plus what results I could earn, plus capitation.

20640. Are you better off or worse off than if you became a teacher immediately after the new system came into operation?—Oh, considerably worse off.

20641. Mr. HENRY.—I do not know that you understand the question. What Sir Henry asked you was this—whether you are better or worse off than if you had not been employed, and just obtained service when the new system came in?—Considerably worse off.

20642. The BISHOP OF ROSE.—Supposing you came out after training from the Training College in mid-summer 1900 or mid-summer 1901, and in three months' after you were appointed to Glenbane as your first appointment, would you be better off in that case than you are at present?—I would be entitled to exactly what I am now claiming, because, in order to be out of training in July, 1901, I should have entered in July, 1900, and I should then be regarded as an existing teacher.

20643. You would have entered in July, 1900, but should you not have gone in for two years' training, because you were not an assistant teacher, and, therefore, one year would not have done you?—No, but two years.

20644. Then you should have entered in 1900?—Yes; that is what I meant to say, my lord.

20645. And because you were training you say you would be regarded as an existing teacher?—Yes, quite so; there was special consideration promised to those who were then undergoing a course of training.

20646. Mr. HENRY.—Do you know that all those who were promised special consideration got it?—Some did and some did not.

20647. The CHAIRMAN.—Are they really considering the cases of these people still?—Oh, we went to considerable trouble at the time, but failed.

20648. Are those cases under examination now?—Oh, no, they gave it up long ago.

20649. The BISHOP OF ROSE.—They were examining some of them in the last couple of years, I understand—I am not aware of it. We got up a great agitation through the country, I believe in 1903 or 1904, and got the cases brought before the Commissioners.

20650. Mr. Birrell submitted a number of cases to the National Board a couple of years ago. Those

cases were considered, and then, after the Central Committee submitted a number of cases, and the Board went into each individual case, and came to the conclusion that there was no substance in them?—I believe those were the undervalued teachers, but we were speaking of transition teachers.

20651. Mr. HENRY.—Have you any idea of what would have been your salary supposing that the system had not been changed when you commenced—can you give your salary and prospects then in a word?—Well, of course, I would start first of all with £52 10s., plus average results in capitation in the particular school plus good service salary. That would have been £94 to begin with if I had earned exactly the same results as my predecessor.

20652. And instead of that you got how much?—Instead of that I got £39. I might calculate upon second class salary; then, of course, after two years I had "very good" reports. It would simply mean that I would get £10 more on promotion to second division of first class.

20653. You would start with £94?—£94.

20654. Instead of £65?—Instead of £90.

20655. And did you make any efforts yourself to have this case reviewed by the Commissioners?—On several occasions. I applied on three occasions, and I got this statement sent to each Commissioner.

20656. The CHAIRMAN.—And what answer did you get?—Just the stereotyped reply to let me know that my case had been considered. This is the statement that I sent, it is dated the 20th of March, 1909:—I beg to bring under the notice of the Commissioners some important particulars regarding my present salary with the hope they will revise and increase it. I was trained in De La Salle College, Waterford, '96 to '98. I passed the final examination with "special distinction," obtaining a percentage of 71, which placed me in first division of second class, with a right to first class without examination, after two years' satisfactory service. After serving some time as substitute, I was appointed (January 1st, 1900) principal of Monmouth N.S. (Roll No. 8,395), Co. Limerick. Here my initial consolidated salary of £66 was determined by calculating second class salary of £52 10s. 6d., plus the average results (£13 8s. 6d.) earned in the three years preceding my appointment, when the average was low and the school inefficient. On the 20th November, 1901, I was appointed principal of present school, where I expected on immediate increase of salary, as the results of this school were more than twice as large as those of Monmouth, but was disappointed. The following is a short summary of particulars as to the salary, service and reports since my appointment to my present school. The report, "fair," was the result of annual inspection held early in January, 1902, about six weeks after my appointment, November 20th, 1901. I then got extracts from the school reports from 1902 to 1909, and proceed. I respectfully submit the following points for the consideration of the Commissioners:—(a) In 1900 I was appointed principal of Monmouth N.S. and was allowed second class salary plus the average results earned there, making a total of £66. In 1901 I was appointed principal of Glenbane N.S., but was not allowed second class salary plus the results earned in Glenbane, which would have made a total of £78 10s. 6d. If Glenbane had been my first appointment, in other words, if I had refused Monmouth and remained idle till a vacancy occurred in Glenbane, my initial consolidated salary would have been £78 10s. 6d. My present consolidated salary, seven years' highly efficient service in same school, is only £77. (b) One consequence of my salary being fixed at £66 was that at end of second triennial period I was eligible only for an increment of £4 to reach maximum of third grade. If on coming to Glenbane I had received even this increase of £4, a sum several times less than that to which I was entitled, I should be in second grade since 1907. (c) I have now completed seven years' highly efficient service in present school, which under the rules superseded in 1906 would have entitled me to first division of first class, with a corresponding increase of income. Considering the peculiar circumstances under which my salary was

29th July, 1913.]

Mr. PATRICK LEAHY examined.

[Continued.]

consolidated, the general excellence of my school reports, and the fact that my salary is so much lower than what I would have received under the old rules. I hope the Commissioners will exercise their power under Rule 105 (a) and grant me at least second grade from 1907, the date of my partial increment." I should like to make clear one or two questions. I was started in the middle of third grade at 256 and it took me ten years to get to the second grade. In the evidence given before you the chief inspector, in reply to question 1835, says, "That is one of the things that make it deplorable, that the teachers have not seen their way to come before this Committee to state their case," that is, that it would take them twelve years to get from the third grade. I started at 256, and it took me almost ten years to reach second grade, that is to get through half a grade.

20647. Mr. HIRAN.—And your report is "good" all along?—My report is "good" all along.

20648. The CHAIRMAN.—What salary are you getting now?—\$87.

20649. Mr. HENLY.—Well you have done what the chief inspector said you ought to do; that is, to come in and give evidence?—Yes; and there is also question 2014.

20650. The CHAIRMAN.—That is on page 731:—"I do not know that I ever came across a case where the merit mark of the school did not correspond with the merit mark of the principal. It is quite easy to see how that might arrive in a case like that one you mention, the case of a very efficient principal coupled with two very inefficient assistants."—I had but one inefficient assistant, and it happened twice in my case. If you turn to question 2011 you will see the other chief inspector said that might occur in the case of a teacher coupled with three inefficient assistants.

20651. Mr. HIRAN.—I think he was only giving an illustration of how it might happen?—But it happened twice in my case with one.

20662. The CHAIRMAN.—Your assistant could pull down your "very good"?—Yes. She had charge, as you will see from the Observation Book, only of infants and first, and Mr. Wolpely referred to some portion of her work as being "very good," and referred to all my work as being "very good," and yet the mark is lowered.

20663. You referred to questions 2040 and 2041. There Sir Hiram Wilkinson asks:—"Have you had many cases in which the school and the head teacher were marked differently?—A few. If you could explain that it would help us to understand better, because it is a difficult subject, that difference between the school and the head teacher?—If you have as principal teacher a very good man and if you have three or four assistants who are quite different, say, fair, the total result to the school will not be 'very good,' that is what you refer to?—Yes. I had but one assistant, who had charge of the infants and first, and portion of her work is put down here as being 'very good.'"

20653a. Have you any other point?—Question 1838. 20654. " . . . And the apparent falling off of the school may be due to some temporary and recent cause"?—That occurred with me. Children who would have been in fifth were then in sixth.

20655. Have you anything else?—No, nothing else. I should like to emphasize the point of the estimate that I put in there that I lost \$211.

20656. You have a prospect of getting increment soon?—Not till next year. You see, on the 1st of April, 1911, I was promoted to second grade, and it will take me at least three years; that will be the 1st of April, 1914, to get increment.

20657. The BRUCE or ROSE.—Do you expect promotion?—Well, I expect the Carlsale and Blake Promotions.

FORTY-FOURTH DAY.—WEDNESDAY, JULY 30TH, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

PRESENT:—Sir SAMUEL DULL, M.A., LL.D., LL.L. (Chairman); The Most Rev. DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross; Sir HIRAN SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN COFFEY; Mr. HENRAGE B. B. HARRISON, B.A.; Mr. JEREMIAH HENLY; Mr. WALTER McFURROUGH KAVANAGH, B.L.; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Mr. D. C. MAHER, B.A., Principal of Ardmoyle National School, Carbal, examined.

20658. The CHAIRMAN.—You are principal teacher of Ardmoyle National School, County Tipperary?—Yes.

20659. How long have you been in the service of the National Education Board?—Thirty years.

20660. How long have you been principal teacher of Ardmoyle School?—Since 1889.

20661. Were you principal of any school before that?—No; I was assistant in a Poor Law Union School.

20662. In the neighbourhood?—In the neighbourhood; and I was monitor for six years in another school before that.

20663. And what is your grading now?—First of first class and first of first grade.

20664. How long have you been that?—Since 1889.

20665. What is your grade under the present system?—First of first grade.

20666. When did you get that?—I got that in 1906.

20667. Before you begin your general statement I want to know have you any personal grievance to bring before us with regard to inspection—are you one of those teachers who seem to think that they have

reasons to complain of the inspectors?—Well, no, I have no personal grievance. I came to give general evidence.

20668. Your reports have all been "good"?—My reports have all been satisfactory.

20669. And you got your increment in due course?—Well, not in due course, because the last increment was delayed, but I got it all the same.

20670. When was that?—I only got that increment in June; the last increment was given to me in June.

20671. It was delayed a year, was it?—It was delayed a year.

20672. Mr. COFFEY.—Till last month?—Till last month.

20673. The CHAIRMAN.—Was that in consequence of a fall in the report?—Yes, in consequence of a fall in the report; but I may explain that it was owing principally to the illness of my assistant. She fell into declining health, and her classes were not really up to the mark—at least that was the case in the last year, but before that the report was lowered. I do not think there was so very much reason for the lowering of the first report.

20th July, 1935.]

Mr. D. C. MAHER, B.A., examined.

[Continued.]

20674. Still, on the whole, you have not very much personally to complain of?—No, sir, I have not. Judging from thirty years' experience of schools and teachers, and having every opportunity of noticing the actions and conduct of the better, as I have attended meetings in every part of Ireland as President and Vice-President of the Teachers' Organisation, I have no hesitation in stating that the following rules of the Commissioners unduly restrict the rights and liberties of teachers as citizens and members of the community among whom they live and work. Rule 88 (b)—

"Members of County or District Councils, Poor Law Guardians, and Town Commissioners, are not recognised as teachers of National Schools unless appointed as 'Additional Councillors' under Section 5 (2) or 25 (1) (a) of the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898, or chosen by the Council, Board of Guardians or Town Commissioners to fill a casual vacancy." 89 (a)

"The attendance of the teachers at meetings held for party political purposes, or the taking part by them in elections for Members of Parliament, or for Poor Law Guardians, etc., except by voting, is strictly forbidden." I must at once admit that these rules are not nearly so stringent as those in operation till 1906. Since I joined the profession in 1881 (and I do not know for how long before), the time-honoured rule, which every teacher was bound to have posted up in front of his (or her) rostrum for his (or her) special guidance, ran as follows:—"To avoid feuds, markets, and meetings, but shew all political meetings of every kind, to abstain from controversy, to be imbued with a spirit of obedience to the law and loyalty to the Sovereign, and to do nothing either in or out of school which might have a tendency to confine it to any denunciation of children." After doing duty for nigh half a century this notorious headline was omitted from the practical rules owing to agitation on the part of the teachers, looked by exposure in Parliament and elsewhere. Teachers could then attend fairs and markets, and apparently private meetings, but another rule came into operation stating:—"The attendance of teachers at public meetings, or meetings held for political purposes . . . is incompatible with the performance of their duties, and is a violation of rules, rendering them liable to withdrawal of salary." (Code of 1903.) In 1906 public meetings were omitted from this rule, and later on in 1911 the word "party" was inserted before political purposes, so that the new rule now reads:—"The attendance of teachers at meetings held for party political purposes . . . is strictly forbidden." A nice distinction is here drawn between political meetings and party political meetings, and this might act as a trap to the unwary teacher, as the Commissioners are to be judges, and might hold that a meeting was party political which the teachers believed was merely political.

20675. Have you known any difficulties to arise under this rule about party political meetings?—I have never had very much experience of it, as the rule is not long in operation, but I can very easily see how a difficulty might arise.

20676. I thought you might know of some cases, perhaps?—No, it is not easy in this country to distinguish which is which with regard to meetings, and there is absolutely no necessity for this rule, and it should be simply abolished.

20677. Mr. Cowley.—But do you not think that after all it has something to commend it even in the interests of the teachers themselves—do you think it is desirable that teachers should be free to mix themselves up with party political meetings?—I do not see why they should be deprived of that right. I cannot see what harm it would do to the cause of education.

20678. The Chairman.—It is recognised in England that teachers of all ranks, though there may be no rule against it, should abstain from taking active part in politics. I have been a head master in a district where political feeling ran very high. There were very strong Dissenters there and Radicals, and there were strong High Churchmen and Tories, and if I had gone and made a speech at a political meeting I should have had the parents in rebellion of one section or the other. Now, an experience like that compels one to abstain, and surely you will admit that a man is not to sacrifice his usefulness in order to take part in politics. You would not

like it in your own case?—Certainly not, but I think the discretion of the teacher would be quite sufficient.

20679. You would rely on the good sense of the teacher?—I would rely on the good sense of the teacher.

20680. Mr. Cowley.—I do not think that anyone would see any objection to allowing the teachers freedom if you were satisfied that they would have the discretion that you have; but there are indiscreet teachers the same as there are indiscreet inspectors, and possibly indiscreet clergymen, who sometimes go into politics rather largely, and it is a question whether, in the interests of the teachers and in the interests of education, the teachers should not keep away from party politics?—I quite agree, but I think when the teachers of England are not subjected to a rule of that kind, I can see no reason why the teachers of Ireland should be subjected to such a rule.

The Chairman.—The teachers in Scotland are not.

20681. Sir HIRSH WATKINSON.—In our experience of the world we find that things that are assumed in one place are not assumed in another, and the point is whether at the present stage of political opinion among the teachers in Ireland it would be safe to believe that they would all act upon the principle upon which you admit they ought to act?—Yes.

And if the Commissioners are not satisfied that in the absence of a rule they would not in that way, I think that the Commissioners are bound, in the interests of education, to make a rule to secure that they shall so act, and I think that that should be the opinion of everybody. The only point for dispute would be whether, as a matter of fact, it would be safe to leave the teachers without any guidance or any instruction on that question. This is a rule that is applicable to all Civil Servants in all parts of His Majesty's dominions, and, therefore, it cannot bear hardly on them when it is so universally applicable, and the only question is whether it is necessary to put it into words. If the Commissioners believe that it is necessary, I submit that they are bound to do it in the interests of education, in the interests of the scholars and in the interests of the teachers themselves.

20682. The Director of Schools.—Sir Hiram has referred to the rule with regard to Civil Servants. I just want to clear up this point. I have often seen statements in the speeches of teachers that they claim to be Civil Servants. Now, if they do claim to be Civil Servants, I agree with Sir Hiram that they cannot go into party politics?—But they do not claim to be Civil Servants.

20683. But you will agree with me that the two things are inconsistent if they claim to be Civil Servants, and if they claim to take a share in party politics?—I know of no representative teacher claiming that the teachers are Civil Servants, because they are not.

20684. That settles that point. Now, secondly, we come to the case of the English teachers. The English teachers are immediately under the control of the local authority, and they are paid by the moneys of the local authority. The Irish teachers are under the control of a local person called the manager, but they are paid by the moneys of the State, and do you not think that there is a difference there between the English teachers and the Irish teachers?—Yes, my lord, but the English teachers are also paid by the State.

20685. Partly, and that indirectly?—Partly, yes.

20686. It is not true, in my opinion, to say that they are paid by the State, but this is true that the money with which the local authority pays them is partly from the State?—That is true.

20687. So I do not think it is true to say that they are paid by the State. It is true to say that the money with which the local authority pays them is partly procured from the State, but partly procured from local sources, whereas the Irish teachers' salaries come through the manager, but the whole money is supplied by the State; so that while I agree with you that they are not Civil Servants, they come nearer to being Civil Servants than the English teachers come?—Yes, but they have not the privileges of Civil Servants, my lord.

20688. I agree with you that they are not Civil Servants?—Yes, and they have not the privileges; but

26th July, 1913.]

Mr. D. C. MANN, B.A., examined.

[Continued.]

with regard to the money coming from the State, English education gets more per head of the population than we do. With regard to the question of Sir Hiram Wilkinson, I think there are two rules here which would meet the case which you have made, Sir Hiram.

20703. The CHAIRMAN.—You say there is absolutely no necessity for this rule, by which the attendance of teachers at meetings held for party political purposes is strictly forbidden?—Yes, and it should be simply abolished. Teachers can now attend, fairs, markets, and meetings, and it is well known neither education nor the teachers have suffered by the change, the latter have not become brawling demagogues, as was feared, and politics have not been introduced into the schools. Again, after the passing of the Local Government Act some teachers, as it was natural to expect, were appointed Urban and District Councils, but the Commissioners apparently decided to take away from them the rights conferred on them by the Act, and so they made the following rule:—88 (b) Urban Councils Rural Councils, Poor Law Guardians, members or officers of school attendance committees or of school committees, etc., cannot be reappointed as National Teachers. (Code of 1905.) Under this rule several teachers were obliged to resign positions to which they were appointed. One teacher in North Tipperary—Mr. Curran, of Riharron Boys' N.S., Ref No. 11735—had to give up the office of secretary to the local School Attendance Committee, and he states that his loss to date is £108.

20704. I suppose that the holding of some of those offices would interfere with some of the teachers' work, would it not? Take the office of County Councillor, would not that interfere with the work of the teacher?—Well, it would if the meetings were held during school hours.

20705. But in point of fact, are not the meetings of every County Council in Ireland held during school hours?—Well, I have known cases where the hour of meeting has been changed.

20706. Not in the case of a County Council?—Perhaps not in the case of a County Council, but in the case of a District Council, so as to meet the convenience of teachers who have been appointed District Councillors.

20707. You mean Urban Councillors, but not Rural District Councillors?—Yes.

20708. But as to the reason of this rule, is it not to be found in the possibility, and perhaps certainty, that the holding of those offices might interfere with the teacher's proper discharge of his duty—is not that the real meaning of it?—Well, I do not know what reason the Commissioners may have when they make a rule.

20709. Well, that was what we were told before. You have been secretary of a local School Attendance Committee yourself?—Yes.

20710. Well, I do not know what the nature of the duties is, but would not that interfere with your school duty?—Not a bit, sir.

20711. Not at all?—Not a bit. In 1907 secretaries of School Attendance Committees were exempted from this rule after this teacher had lost the post. I was myself appointed a member of a School Attendance Committee in 1906, as the Committee met in my school, and there was great difficulty about procuring a quorum at the meetings.

20712. When did they meet—in the evening?—They met during the play hour in my school.

20713. So that it did not interfere with your work?—Not in the least. The manager wrote to the Education Office, stating the circumstances, and asking exemption for me, but he told me that he was informed in reply that if I resigned my position as National teacher there would be no objection to my being a member of the Committee. In 1911 all allusion to School Attendance Committees was omitted from the rules, and so the teachers can now be members of these Committees, and yet no evil results have followed.

20714. Are many of them sitting on School Attendance Committees now?—Well, there are certainly some. On the contrary, as was only to be expected, whenever teachers have succeeded in getting on these Committees they have proved themselves most useful members, and where they have been appointed Urban

District or County Councillors under the new rule, instead of hindering, they have helped education by securing an interest in it.

20715. But under the new rules they must be co-opted?—Yes. There is no reason, then, why teachers should not have the same civil rights as all other members of the community, and especially as those rights are enjoyed by the teachers of England and Scotland.

20716. Can they sit on Boards in England and Scotland?—Oh, assuredly they can. The curious part of the present rule regarding elections to Urban, District and County Councils is that teachers can now be elected by the Councillors, and they cannot be elected by the ordinary voters.

The BASTON or ROSE.—That is, they are co-opted.

20717. The CHAIRMAN.—They have not to go through the ordeal of election. Do the County Council merely say—"We will co-opt this man"?—Oh, there is a vote on it among the County Councillors, and they have to canvass those Councillors in the same way as they have to canvass the ordinary voters.

20718. That is not my idea of co-opting, but, at any rate, go on?—This chess-playing seems absurd.

20719. What is the chess-playing?—The difference between electing a man and his being co-opted by the Council; being elected by them instead of by the ordinary voters.

20720. The BASTON or ROSE.—You talk of the fact that teachers cannot be elected as degrading and expostulating. Now, you are aware, no doubt, that the clergy, both Catholic and Protestant, has been excluded from Boards of Guardians from the very time the Act was passed, and you are also aware that clergymen of all denominations have been excluded from County Councils and District Councils and Urban Councils. Is that not so?—Yes.

20721. Therefore the teachers are in no worse position than the clergy of all denominations?—Yes, but two wrongs never make a right.

20722. Then you hold that it is a wrong?—Quite so.

20723. Then while I cannot be elected to a County Council or Urban Council, I can be, and I actually have been, appointed by a County Council on their various Committees: on their Technical Instruction Committee, their Agricultural Committee, their Asylum Committee, their Hospital Committee, and all their various Committees, so that though I cannot be elected I am appointed by the County Council?—Yes.

20724. And, furthermore, while I cannot be a Poor Law Guardian, I had a Royal Warrant from the King to examine into the Poor Law systems of Great Britain and Ireland. Now, all that being so, in your sentence, "The whole thing is absurd," so very conclusive?—Well, as I said before, two wrongs never make a right. You say it is wrong.

20725. I do not?—I thought you admitted it was wrong.

20726. No such thing. I simply stated the facts. I am expressing no opinion one way or the other, but the fact is so since 1888, and continues so?—But I say that is a wrong, and if you deprive us in the same manner that is another wrong, and two wrongs won't make a right. That is my answer to the question.

20727. We are deprived by law and you are deprived by rule of the Board?—Yes.

20728. So the rule of the Board is no more obeyed than the Poor Law Act and the Local Government Act and a number of other Acts of Parliament. They are both equally reasonable or both equally absurd?—I certainly agree with you, if the circumstances are parallel.

20729. The CHAIRMAN.—You say you asked to have rules expunged?—Yes, we asked them to have Rules 88 (b) and 99 (a) expunged from the code, as they serve no useful purpose, and as the following rule is quite sufficient to safeguard the interests of education. This is Rule 89 (a):—"Teachers are not permitted to carry on or engage in any business or occupation, or to be members of any association tending to impair their usefulness as teachers." There is one part of the rule with which I do not agree, namely, "Or to be members of any association." In fact, that might be extended to even our own organisation.

20717. But it must be such an association as would tend to inspire their usefulness?—We may be told that being members of the Organisation might impair our usefulness.

That is where you might let difference of opinion interfere with your work.

20718. Mr. HENLY.—But you have not done that yet?—We have not. I will accept the rule with these words left out, "Or to be members of any association." Then it would read, "Teachers are not permitted to carry on or engage in any business or occupation tending to impair their usefulness as teachers." I accept that, and I think that would be quite sufficient. And there is also another rule. The first practical rule for teachers is, "To act in the spirit of obedience to the law and loyalty to the Sovereign." That is the first practical rule applying to all teachers. My point is that the rule which I have read to you—"Teachers are not permitted to carry on or engage in any business or occupation tending to impair their usefulness as teachers"—that and the following—"Teachers are bound to act in the spirit of obedience to the law and loyalty to the Sovereign," are quite sufficient.

20719. You think that that should form a part of the rule?—Yes. Having this rule to fall back upon, surely there cannot be the least necessity for retaining 88 (b) and 89 (a), while those latter are harmful to the interests of education, and degrading and contemptible to the teachers.

20720. The Bishop called your attention to those words, and do you still abide by them?—I think I will abide by them.

20721. You say you will abide with them; then I venture to repeat what I said, that we teachers, as in England, as a rule voluntarily held aloof from political meetings. Do we degrade ourselves by that?—No, you do it voluntarily, and I believe we would do the same under similar circumstances.

20722. We do that for a higher object, because our principal business is the education of the children, and I think that that is what is meant by the Board in this rule?—Well, I do not think we ought to be put into a position in which it can be said that a rule has to be made by the Board to force us to do our business in a proper and becoming manner.

20723. Mr. HENLY.—But had they not to make rules for the due observance and the due discharge of the business in other respects as well as that?—Quite so.

20724. But you do not consider those degrading, that is that you must work a certain time, and so on?—Oh, no, that is a different thing.

20725. The CHAIRMAN.—I freely admit that it is a debatable question, but it is an old rule of rhetoric that if you overstate your case, or use too strong language in stating it, you are only weakening it?—If you think it well I will leave out "degrading," in deference to the remarks of the Committee.

20726. That is for yourself. I have merely made a suggestion?—Well, I hold by "exasperating."

20727. Very well. Just do as you please; it is not for us to dictate to you. Now, we go on to the question of inspection?—The present inspection system is not just to the teacher, to the child, or even to the inspector. It is not just to the teacher, as it often makes him suffer for circumstances over which he has no control. Schools have been inspected on most unenviable days; epidemics have occurred immediately before inspection; members of the school staff have suffered from lingering illness before inspection, and yet in all these cases reports have been either lowered or kept low, and increments and promotion refused. I can give various instances to prove these statements. One large school in this locality, Moyra National School, Roll No. 463, which had previously got five "very good" reports, was examined in November, 1910.

20728. Mr. CORRY.—By whom?—I think by Mr. Welby. (Witness hands in statement regarding Moyra National School.)

20729. The CHAIRMAN.—This states that the school was examined in 1910 by Mr. Welby, and got "good" after five "very good." On the 23rd and 24th of November, 1910, it was inspected by Mr. Welby and got "good," and the mark has remained "good" ever since?—The teacher does not so much object to the inspector, but he objects to the system by which that

can be done, and he makes that clear in his statement. That school was examined in November, 1910, on an extremely wet day, with only 113 present out of 139 the previous day. The poor little children were sequestered with rain, and notwithstanding this, the inspection and examination (as it was really that) lasted from about 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. Surely the pupils could not be in form for this ordeal. Again, an epidemic of measles set in sometime before this inspection and rendered the attendance of junior pupils irregular. The inspector found fault with them and with their teacher (a young assistant), the result being that the merit mark was lowered to "good." Previous inspections were unstinted in their praise of this school.

20730. Mr. CORRY.—How did the inspector find fault with the teacher—was it by the lowering of the mark, or did he express himself in a fault-finding way?—He said the proficiency of the infants was not to the mark, as far as I can understand Mr. Colman's explanation here in this statement.

20731. The CHAIRMAN.—I will read it. Here it is:—"Our pupils, especially the seniors, seemed to cope and farm openwork immediately after Mr. Fitzpatrick's arrival, and an epidemic of measles set in among the juniors between that time and Mr. Welby's arrival. We closed for midsummer vacation, 29th July, and did not resume business till 24th September. Our average for September was only 114.6, and for October 128.5, owing to the epidemic. Mr. Welby arrived before 9 o'clock on the morning of 23rd November, 1910. That morning was extremely wet, and we had but 113 pupils present. I need scarcely tell you they were not in good form to undergo an examination, as they were actually drenched through and through. We had 126 present the previous day, and 151 the succeeding one. He commenced his inspection and examination at 8.55 o'clock and continued without interruption till 4.5 o'clock. He left without finishing, and came the morning of the 24th November, when he remained from 9 o'clock till 10.5 o'clock. We had no fault whatever to find with his manner or method of examining during the whole time. He was most courteous to each of the three assistants and to me and questioned very fairly too. What we considered, and still consider, most unfair, was the fact of his lowering our report under the circumstances I have mentioned without taking them into consideration. If he held only inspection we would not have much grounds for complaint, but the time occupied in inspection and examination speaks for itself." This is a favourable report of his manner, and style of examination that we are not accustomed to?—Yes; my point comes in that the report was lowered all the same. Previous inspectors were unstinted in their praise of this school, but on this occasion, under the circumstances mentioned, the school could not show its best, and so the principal teacher must suffer. I should like to give a full account of all this case. The next school to mine, Nodavon National School, Roll No. 2670, had five consecutive "good" reports, but in the last year of the second triennial period, 1910, there was a change of inspectors.

20732. Who was the new inspector?—Mr. Fitzpatrick. The new inspector remained for his annual inspection from 10.15 a.m. to 1.20 p.m. During 80 minutes of this time he kept a division of mental arithmetic on the floor—an extraordinary length of time to keep children standing at a most trying mental exercise.

20733. That was Mr. Fitzpatrick?—Yes.

20734. And that was extraordinary?—Yes. After a short inspection of other subjects he reported the test of the school as somewhat lifeless (but how could he say he otherwise after 80 minutes' mental arithmetic), and thus at one stroke, after this short visit, deprived the teacher of his increment. To make matters worse, at the next annual inspection another new inspector came on a severe wet morning, when the pupils were wet and cold and dull, and as a consequence the merit mark was not raised, and so the injustice continued.

20735. There had been five "good" reports, and the inspector reduced the mark to "fair"?—Yes, he reduced the mark to "fair," and at the next inspection it remained so.

20th July, 1913.]

Mr. D. C. MANN, K.A., examined.

[Continued.]

20738. The school had got "good" reports from 1905 to 1909, and in 1910 Mr. Fitzpatrick reduced it to "fair," and the remarks here are—"My great grievance is that . . . I was victimised, first by reduction of the merit mark, and secondly by loss of increment, etc." The point is that this school had got five "goods," and now got "fair"?—Yes, and that "fair" was given in the last year of the triennial incremental period. Another neighbouring school, Ballymanna, was closed for two years. The pupils scattered to five surrounding schools. Some had long distances to go, and consequently got into irregular habits. Others went to no school. A new teacher was appointed in January, 1908. He had, of course, many difficulties to contend with in bringing his new pupils up to a desirable standard, owing to the irregularity of their attendance and their returning to the school in small numbers from time to time. Nevertheless, two inspectors who visited the school in that year, Messrs. McHenry and Brown, have testified to the good work of the teacher. Mr. Brown, who fully understood the circumstances of the school, reported at his annual inspection in November, 1908—"The school is doing well and is very promising; very good progress has been made since the school was established. The instruction is careful and intelligent." A junior inspector, Mr. J. A. Cole, comes on the scene the following year, November, 1909, subjects the pupils (many of them) to a most rigid examination, would not listen to the circumstances of the school, complained of reading and arithmetic, and lowered the merit mark to "fair."

20739. Have you the previous merit mark?—Well, the school was not long opened, and the previous merit mark was Mr. Brown's. I have his previous report, that the school is very promising.

20738. But what was the mark—Mr. McHenry and Mr. Brown both examined the school—do you see the mark they gave?—Here is what the teacher says about that:—"Owing to the visits of two temporary inspectors—Messrs. Cole and Fitzpatrick—to this school, I have been deprived of my increment since last April, 1911. I beg respectfully to lay my case before the Commissioners. I was appointed principal of this school on the 7th January, 1908. I had very great difficulties to encounter to bring this school to a uniform state of efficiency. Messrs. Brown and McHenry were the inspectors of the circuit at the time. They understood the circumstances of the school and the difficulties I had to encounter. Both of them were very well pleased with my work, and Mr. Brown assured me, if I continued my work as I had for the first year in this school he would raise my report from 'good' to 'very good.'"

20739. And it was lowered to "fair." Now, will you go on with the pupils?—Mr. Fitzpatrick came the next year, 1910, adopted a totally different system from that of his predecessor, pinned his faith to mental arithmetic and analysis, kept the class for nearly two hours at these subjects, reported the school as dull, and left the merit mark as he found it, thus depriving this young teacher of his hard earned increment.

20740. That was the second year it got "fair"?—Yes, and will you permit me to read some of the statements given to the children for analysis?

20741. We cannot?—I want to show the difference in style of examination.

20742. If we did that we might be sitting here for years?—My point was to show the difference in the style of examination adopted.

20743. It may be desirable, but we cannot do it; we have not the time for it, so please go on?—The reports and observations of the next two inspections held by Mr. Fitzgerald were of a different nature. Both have borne testimony to the good work of this teacher. Mr. Fitzgerald's last report (November 1, 1912), states—"The principal is a painstaking and skilful teacher. Pupils making satisfactory progress. Their written work is carefully done. Principal makes careful preparation for all lessons, and he has created a spirit of earnestness among the pupils. Arithmetic is taught intelligently. Geography and history on right lines."

20744. Did he give a "good" mark for that?—Well, when he was leaving the school the teacher asked him what mark he would give, or would he give him "good" this time, and he said that he was not perfectly sure.

20745. What did he give him?—In this case he got "good." Here two experienced inspectors, before Messrs. Cole and Fitzpatrick and two others after, have testified as to the capacity and work of this teacher, and he is deprived of his increment because of the apparently ill-considered reports of the other two.

20746. Mr. CORRY.—Mr. Fitzpatrick was not a temporary inspector?—What he means by that is that he was there a very short time. That word is inaccurate, perhaps, but that is what the teacher states.

20747. The CHAIRMAN.—You say Mr. Cole's report did not reach the teacher until almost five months after the date of inspection, thus preventing an appeal in this case?—Yes.

20748. Mr. CORRY.—He appealed against Mr. Fitzpatrick's mark?—Quite so, and the appeal had no effect. I have been reading from a statement which has been recently sent up to the Education Office by the teacher. The whole case is put here, and this is the reply:—

" OFFICE OF NATIONAL EDUCATION,

" 1st July, 1913.

" REV. SIR.—With reference to your communication of the 11th of March last, I am directed by the Commissioners of National Education to inform you that it is regretted that the character of the report on the services of Mr. Thomas Feehan, principal teacher of the above-named school, is not of such merit as to warrant the award of an increment of good service salary. His claim will be further considered in connection with the next general report on the school."

20749. When this appeal was made what reports had he had?—He had two "fairs" and a "good" following.

20750. Mr. CORRY.—And a "good" proceeding?—A "good" preceding the two "fairs."

20751. Mr. HENRY.—What grade was he in?—Second grade.

20752. The CHAIRMAN.—I suppose practically these marks did not allow of increment. You say so much depends on the inspector?—Yes. The present system of inspection is not fair to the child. When so much depends on the inspector, the teacher is naturally inclined to follow any particular ideas of any particular inspector, often against his own matured judgment, and to the detriment of more important branches of education. One inspector has a pronounced wish for a certain kind of mental arithmetic, another for grammar, a third for nature study, a fourth for the condition of school floors, etc. To such an extent is this carried that a young inspector on a recent occasion wrote in my observation book, when he saw a few crumbs on the floor where the infants were standing—"Under no condition should the junior children be allowed to eat luncheon in school." As there is no shelter in the playground, this means that poor little miles of from three to six years should be turned out in hail, rain or snow to take their little repast, lest forthwith a crumb may fall on the floor.

20753. You disregarded the remark, I suppose?—Well, I can tell you I did, Sir Samuel.

20754. Did you hear of it again?—No. The present system is not just to the inspectors themselves. It is not fair to require an inspector to decide in a few hours the difference between a "good" and a "fair" school, or between a "good" and a "very good" one, a difference which under present arrangements may mean hundreds of pounds to the teacher of that school by way of continued increments and promotion. The following important extract from Mr. Dale's report on Primary Education in Ireland (1904) proves my contention—Page 26. "The Irish system appears to me to compare unfavourably in its bearing on efficiency and expenditure with the English in the following respects—97. In the first place, it imposes upon the Irish Central Authority, and in particular on the Irish Inspectors, a responsibility which in England the Central Authority

30th July, 1948.]

Mr. D. C. MAHEU, B.A., examined.

[Continued.]

has always avoided, viz., the selection of individual teachers for promotion. The present position of Inspectors, whether in England or Ireland, is for several reasons hardly compatible with the performance of such a delicate and arduous task. Unless the number of Government inspectors is greatly increased, they must always have districts extending over a wide area, and comprising a considerable number of schools in them; an inspector cannot, therefore, hope to visit any individual school more than twice or three times a year. Even then the time at his disposal cannot be wholly given to an examination of the teaching, since he has also to inspect the premises and apparatus, to confer with managers, and to satisfy himself that the general conditions other than efficiency of teaching, on which the State grant is paid, are duly satisfied.

20755. Do you find the manager coming to attend your examinations, and confer with the inspector on those occasions?—Well, sometimes.

20756. We have had very different evidence on that subject. You find your manager comes on inspection day?—Well, sometimes.

20757. Not always?—Oh, not always.

20758. The BISHOP or ROSE.—Does the manager or his curate visit the school frequently?—Yes.

20759. How frequently?—Well, sometimes we will have the curate twice a week, and the manager sometimes twice a week or once a week.

20760. And they visit all the surrounding schools quite frequently?—In my parish that is the case.

20761. And in the district altogether?—Well, I do not know much about other schools, but that is the case in my own parish and with my own clergy.

20762. Are you aware that there is an ecclesiastical rule of the Catholic Church in Ireland binding the manager or his curate to visit the schools frequently?—I understood that there was such a rule.

The BISHOP or ROSE.—Oh, yes, there is.

20763. The CHAIRMAN.—You refer to the relation of the inspector to the teachers?—Yes. His relations, therefore, to the teachers in his district are necessarily very different from those of the head of a department to the subordinates in his office, and of the head master of a school to his assistants, or even of a local manager to the teachers he employs. In those cases the person on whose decision promotion depends is in constant touch with the candidates for it; he has daily opportunities of seeing and supervising their work, and forming a complete estimate of their relative character and abilities. A Government Inspector, however, who only sees a teacher for a short time on two or three days in a year, will be able to form a general judgment on the capacity of a teacher; but he cannot hope to acquire the full knowledge and evidence which would be necessary in order to enable him to compare unhesitatingly the respective merits of several candidates, all more or less suitable, and to justify his selection if it is challenged.

20764. That is one great superiority of the English system, that under their system of local authorities the local inspector comes into constant touch with the teacher?—Quite so.

20765. And the local authority know the merits of their own teachers thoroughly well. That is one great difference between the two systems?—Yes.

20766. Now, in connection with that, I suppose you find that the inspector is not retained long enough in one district to gauge them well—do you find that inspectors are changed too frequently?—I think they are.

20767. To meet those remarks of yours an inspector under the present system ought to remain a good while in a district to obtain a knowledge of the teachers. You say that they can get very little knowledge, and it follows, therefore, that the longer the inspector remains the more he will know?—That is true.

20768. But you have not noticed that point about frequent changes?—No, I have not noticed it, but, of course, you can draw that conclusion from what I have stated here.

20769. The BISHOP or ROSE.—Are you aware that the promotion of the English teacher is made on the report of the local inspector?—I am aware.

20770. And that a considerable amount of friction sometimes arises between the local inspector and the teachers?—That might occur, of course.

20771. There is only one inspector here, and the promotion depends on his report?—Yes.

20772. And friction arises because the promotion depends on his report?—Yes.

20773. Now, in England the promotion depends on the report of an inspector, not of His Majesty's inspector, but an inspector?—Yes.

And Mr. Dale when he appeared here, I think, practically admitted that shifting the selection was simply shifting the friction.

The CHAIRMAN.—I understood that the friction was much less.

The BISHOP or ROSE.—The friction is less.

Mr. HENRY.—Increments in England are practically automatic.

The BISHOP or ROSE.—We are discussing promotion. Mr. HENRY.—But there is no friction. If a man is appointed as assistant he goes on to the mainman.

20774. The BISHOP or ROSE.—But there is promotion from one school to another, and that depends on the inspector's report?—I understood that there was very little friction, my lord. I was speaking to an English teacher last week about that matter, and he says that there is very little friction.

20775. But you see that after all the promotion of any teacher depends on the report of an inspector. You cannot get over that?—Well, it does partly, my lord, but not altogether, because it depends also upon the manager and upon the committee.

20776. The CHAIRMAN.—The Education Committee has a great deal to do with it?—And the manager has a great deal to do with it. I do not object to inspection as inspection pure and simple, but I object to the teachers' interests being so vitally concerned by it. So many extraneous circumstances affect the work of an Irish school that any slight falling-off in educational efficiency should not be the cause of penal consequences to the teacher. The present merit marks should be abolished, and promotions and increments should come as a matter of course for good service, unless there is a serious decline in educational efficiency—a decline for which the teacher can reasonably be held accountable.

20776a. Does the inspector's report would come in?—Then the inspector's report would come in. Perhaps the greatest blot on the present inspection system is the mutual distrust and suspicion which, rightly or wrongly, it seems to have engendered between inspector and teacher. I have discussed this matter with many teachers all over the country, and I find the general idea exists that the inspector comes to the school merely to detect or find fault, and duly report those faults (be they great or small) to the Education Office in Dublin. The over-sensitiveness of many inspectors and their unsympathetic attitude seem to be the principal cause of this feeling—a feeling which is very injurious to the best interests of education, as it damps the spirit and ardour and enthusiasm of the teacher. I have known teachers in my locality who became quite disheartened by the adverse criticism and fault-finding of inspectors. The sudden changes of school programmes for some years past have made the work of the teachers, and, I believe, of the inspectors, very difficult, and are not conducive to the general improvement of education. May I remark with regard to those merit marks, that I think those marks should be altogether abolished, and that when a school is inspected, if the inspector's report is such that it would mean a loss of increment or promotion to a teacher, that teacher should see a copy of that report before it is sent to the office, and then he should be at liberty to call for a full examination of his school by an independent examiner.

20777. Do you mean each time that he is discontented?—Not merely discontented, but when it would mean a loss of increment or promotion, that then he should be at liberty to call for a full examination of the school.

20778. Mr. HENRY.—And would you not take into consideration his professional reputation of all?—All the circumstances.

90th July, 1913.]

Mr. D. C. MARRIS, B.A., examined.

[Continued.]

20779. But you say that you would only allow that in one increment or promotion was endangered?—Yes.

20780. Would not his professional reputation be dearer to him than either promotion or increments?—Yes, I quite agree that if he thinks that it would also interfere with his professional reputation he should be at liberty also to appeal against the Inspector's report.

20781. So that it comes to this, that you think that on any and every occasion the teacher should have the right of appeal?—That he should have the right of appeal; that is, if the report is adverse, and if he considers that he has a good case to meet the Inspector's report on his appeal.

Mr. HENLY.—Give him the right of appeal and you will have very few appeals.

20782. Mr. CORRY.—He should have the right of appeal if, as you say, he believes an injustice has been done?—He should have the right of appeal if he believes an injustice has been done, and that appeal should be for a full examination of the school, and all the circumstances affecting it.

20783. Mr. HENLY.—By the chief inspector?—Well, the chief inspector would be merely an advocate for the other side.

20784. The CHAIRMAN.—Then who should hold it?—I think they are talking of appointing four divisional inspectors.

But would not the same objection lie against them as against the chief inspector, so I do not think that you would get rid of the objection by that?

20785. Mr. CORRY.—The fact is that if the teacher had the appeal as a matter of right there would be very few appeals?—Well that is my point; but I entirely object to these merits marks.

The CHAIRMAN.—Well, we have had an immense volume of evidence upon that, and you need not go into that.

20786. Mr. CORRY.—Do you think that education in the Clonmel district has gained by the discontent of the teachers at the lowering of the merit marks?—Well, I am perfectly certain that the education in the district has not been improved by the lowering of these marks.

20787. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you anything else that you wish to bring before us?—Well, there is this case of Mr. Feehan, that shows the difficulties of the present inspection system.

The CHAIRMAN.—If that is a very typical case you will be good enough to hand it in. (Witness hands in paper.)

Mr. GEORGE O'CALLAGHAN, Principal of Mahonagh National School, Newcastle, County Limerick, examined.

20788. The CHAIRMAN.—How long have you been principal of Mahonagh School?—Thirteen years.

20789. That is just since 1900?—Exactly.

20790. And were you principal before that?—I was in Killybeg in the County Clare, and at Annaghlin in the County Clare.

20791. And what is your grade under the new system?—Second grade.

20792. What was your classification under the old?—First.

20793. First of first?—I got first of first when I changed from Killybeg to Annaghlin. I would not be allowed under the new scale for promotion at the time to get first of first in Killybeg.

20794. You are in the second grade now?—Second grade.

20795. And you have been in that for how long?—Well, my salary is just the same amount now as twenty years ago.

20796. Mr. HENLY.—You got no increment?—I got 22, bringing me up to the maximum of the second grade, and then 127 (b) was introduced into my school, which has taken away the benefit of that 22.

20797. The CHAIRMAN.—Are you one of those teachers who complain of the reduction of marks in the last two years?—Certainly that is my experience.

20798. Who was your inspector?—Mr. McNell was my inspector before he was appointed chief inspector.

20799. He was your senior inspector?—Yes.

20800. What district is that?—Limerick.

20801. And did he lower your mark?—Not Mr. McNell, but his junior, Mr. McMahon. In the year 1906 I had earned my promotion. Mr. Hughes was my inspector at the time; he gave me a report, "almost very good." Then the office communicated with Mr. Hughes, and told him that he should confine himself to the official form of reporting, and it was left at "good."

20802. He substituted "good"?—Yes; so then, in the month of April, I asked why my promotion that I had earned was delayed, and word came that my promotion would depend on the report of the incoming inspector—that is in 1906. Mr. McMahon came to my school in July, and he dropped me to "fair."

20803. That was in 1906?—1906.

20804. And all hope of promotion disappeared?—Yes, for the time, and since then owing to 127 (b).

20805. And what has your mark been since?—"Fair" and "good."

20806. All the time?—All the time.

20807. What are your numbers there?—For the last year 44.9; and if 127 (b) had not come into operation it would be 70.

20808. You have a junior assistant mistress, I suppose?—No, sir; our Bishop won't allow any junior assistant mistress.

20809. Now, do you wish to go over those heads that you have put down—they chiefly relate to 127 (b)?—Yes.

20810. Boys under seven years are ineligible for enrolment in the school?—Ineligible.

20811. And the probable effect of that rule would be the loss of an assistant teacher to the school. That is the rule you complain of?—Yes, that is the rule.

20812. What have you to tell us under the first head as to how it affects the pay and prospects of teachers?—In 1906 a vacancy occurred for an assistant, and the Commissioners asked the manager to appoint a female assistant to the school, and the manager would not do so, and the Commissioners then enforced 127 (b), and the average was quite sufficient at the time to maintain an assistant in the school; so in our diocese, at least in the diocese of Limerick, whatever has occurred between Dr. Storkie and Dr. O'Dwyer, it is enforced more in our schools, more in Limerick than in any other county in Ireland.

20813. What is enforced?—127 (b).

20814. Mr. CORRY.—That is to say, the Commissioners are enforcing it on the one side, and Dr. O'Dwyer on the other side won't allow the children to go?—Yes, he won't allow them. I have 15 or 20 of them every day, and the assistant must teach them.

20815. The CHAIRMAN.—They do not appear on your roll?—No.

20816. The BISHOP or BARR.—You stated a while ago that if 127 (b) had not come into operation your average would be 70?—Yes.

20817. That hardly fits in with your statement that you have an average of 44.9?—The average I gave was only those between 3 and 15. I had not included the senior boys. There are boys over 15 in my school who are not marked on the roll at all.

20818. But, of course, you could not write those boys in any case. Suppose you were able to enrol the small children, the infants and small boys, what would be the average of your school?—It would not be 70?—It would be 70. 1905, 64.8, not including any boy over 15, only 3 to 15; 1906, 64; 1907, 59.5; 1908, 65.9; 1909, 59.7; 1910, 50.1.

The average of the figures is 60 instead of 70!

Mr. HENLY.—Would not an average of 50 be enough?

20819. The BISHOP or BARR.—I am not questioning that at all; I am questioning the statement, or rather wanting to correct the statement that you made a while ago?—My average would be 70 if I could include the boys under 7 years.

20820. When you did include them your average was not 70?—Oh, it was. I am only giving you those between 8 and 15.

20821. That is, the boys you are entitled to enrol?—No; boys between 15 and 18 can be enrolled.

20822. The CHAIRMAN.—And how many of those have you?—I have 7 and 8 and 9, and they would vary from year to year, and they would be added on to the 60's.

20823. Why are they not added on?—Well, we had a correspondence I short time ago in the Dublin Press about 127 (b). Of course, it is the average that affected my capitulation. In 1910 I lost £2 10s. capitulation, in 1911 £28 capitulation, and in 1912 £3 15s.; so during the three years it has been in operation I have lost £9 5s. in capitulation, and my promotion and my prospects are for ever blocked by the enforcement of the rule.

20824. The BISHOP or ROSE.—But your promotion has been blocked by your report being only "fair"?—But when you see the number coming down to that I need not tell that you are not so very anxious to over exert yourself to work up, when you see that promotion is blocked.

20825. The CHAIRMAN.—You say that you will never get promotion owing to the fall of your average?—Owing to the fall of my average.

20826. The BISHOP or ROSE.—And, therefore, your energies were not quite so active?—I do not admit that; and I think the same thing prevails in every profession.

20827. You were desirous to exert yourself?—Yes, desirous, and every effort I made was of no avail.

20828. Are you in favour of 127 (b) or against it?—Certainly against it, and so is our Bishop against it.

20829. If you are strongly opposed to the rule, and if your Bishop is very strongly opposed to it also, I think you ought rather to applaud him?—Who?

20830. The BISHOP?—Well, I would be very slow to applaud any man, whether a Bishop or layman, if I don't know that he deserves it.

20831. In this matter, if you are so opposed to 127 (b), and if anybody takes your point of view, ought not you to be pleased?—You see, my lord, it is more through signs that the rule is enforced in our diocese than anything else.

20832. Do you think that is so on the part of ecclesiastical authority?—I do not think so.

20833. Mr. COWRY.—I think Mr. O'Callaghan's point is that the plague is on the part of the official administration, that Dr. O'Dwyer having refused to allow them to put this rule in operation in the diocese, they have been enforcing it more in the County of Limerick than any other place?—Yes, that is what I mean.

20834. Sir HENRY WHARFORD.—I understand that your complaint is this, that by reason of the disagreement between the manager and the Board you suffer?—Between the Bishop and the Board.

20835. But he controls the manager—that by reason of that disagreement you suffer?—Yes.

20836. And whatever your opinion of the action of the Bishop or of the Board may be does not matter, but it is on account of that disagreement that you suffer?—That is what I think.

20837. The BISHOP or ROSE.—Have you any evidence of that, for I have never heard of any disagreement between your Bishop and the Board?—Between the Bishop and Dr. Starke.

20838. I have never heard of it, and have you any evidence to show that that is so, or are you merely expressing a conjecture?—Well, I was bringing forward letters at the time, when another Commission was sitting some years ago, when they had some till, and Dr. Starke said to myself, that our Bishop was the only man who objected to the appointment of junior assistant mistresses, and to the enforcement of this rule, and "I will make him too the line," Dr. Starke said that to me.

20839. On a deputation?—He said it to me on a deputation, and I think it is nearly a well-known fact that Dr. Starke and Dr. O'Dwyer never agreed very well on educational matters.

20840. Now, take No. 2. You say—"I have experience of various inspectors, and appealed to the Board for protection against the conduct of one"?—Yes.

20841. Who was that?—Mr. MacMahon.

20842. Who reduced you to "fair"?—Yes, to "fair."

20843. Did you actually appeal?—I did. I appealed three or four years ago.

20844. And you got no satisfaction?—Well, I lodged the appeal on the 16th of February through the manager.

20845. Mr. COWRY.—Against the mark of the inspectors?—Against the mark and against the attitude of this inspector in my school towards myself and towards the pupils; and in the month of May, three months afterwards, Mr. McNeill came into my school without any notice whatsoever of his coming to investigate the charge.

20846. He was chief inspector then?—He was senior inspector.

20847. The CHAIRMAN.—Did he tell you with what purpose he came?—No, sir; I thought it might be an ordinary incidental visit on his part still be brought out the boys and examined them, and I mentioned certain boys called names by that district inspector, and Mr. O'Neill brought them out. It was only then that I knew that he came as a result of my letter to the Board.

20848. Then you know that he had come to test your school on the subject of this appeal?—Yes.

20849. How long did he stay?—He stayed about two hours.

20850. And what was the result as regards the appeal?—I have heard nothing about the result since.

20851. What date was that?—Three years last May.

20852. And you never heard anything?—Never, not a word directly.

20853. You never got an answer to the appeal?—No.

20854. Good, bad or indifferent?—Good, bad or indifferent.

20855. Mr. COWRY.—Did the appeal go from your self or through the manager?—Through the manager.

20856. The CHAIRMAN.—You say: "So I have serious reason to be fault with inspectors." With all of them?—Yes; of course, my experience is very extensive in 22 years, and I have met 25 or 30 of them officially, and I have only met one or two that I was ever benefited by.

20857. The BISHOP or ROSE.—What do you say about their fairness and their justice—that is what we have to consider?—Well, I know that a lot depends on your standing in the particular district, with some inspectors, and a lot depends on their state of health at the time they come into your school.

20858. You give your opinion about 25 or 30, that only one or two of them benefited you; but I want to see what you think of their fairness and justice?—I mean by "benefited" that I would like them to visit me, that I would feel better, I do not mean to benefit me financially.

20859. The CHAIRMAN.—You mean, to benefit by their advice and counsel?—To benefit by their advice and counsel, and I would like them to come again.

20860. The BISHOP or ROSE.—And you think their visiting you was useless except in the case of those two or three?—Yes, two.

20861. Mr. HENLY.—Did you experience any harsh treatment from them?—Well, yes.

20862. What kind?—I had the privilege of being in contact with Mr. McMillan, and he wanted to get me reprimanded at one time.

20863. The CHAIRMAN.—At what date was Mr. McMillan an inspector in that district?—I think it was about the year 1897.

20864. The BISHOP or ROSE.—That was when you were in the County Clerks?—Yes, Annaghfield.

20865. And he was one of the inspectors who were harsh to you?—Yes, in such a way that I presided at a meeting at the time of the local association, and we passed a resolution rejecting at his departure from the district.

20866. What year did he go away?—1898, I think, sir.

20th July, 1918.]

Mr. GEORGE O'MALLAHAN examined.

[Continued.]

20857. Mr. HASKY.—What did he want to get you recommended for?—Well, his manner was most extraordinary. He would sneak into the school and would have his car 100 yards from the place. We heard that if you saluted him, or made any fuss about him, he would tell you to mind your business. He did not salute me when he came into the school. He passed over to the desk and I continued my work, so after about five minutes he called me over. "You are troubling me," he said, "with great discourtesy by not standing when I come into the school and saluting me." "Oh," said I, "I did not know who you were at all." "You did not know who I was?" said he. I said "No." "I am Mr. McMillan, the Inspector." That was the first I heard of who he was. I think no person would take him, from his dress or appearance, or anything else, to be an inspector. He asked me to apologise to him and I declined to apologise. He said: "Then I will not take notice at the present time, but I will see that you treat visitors in a proper fashion when they come into your school." (He made out that he was an ordinary visitor.) It remained so till the following examination that I had, and I had 91 children to prepare that time in the school without any help unless from the mistress and workmistress, and the manager (Oscar Macanassa at the present time) would not appoint an assistant till this morning I had would be qualified to become an assistant, so I had to do the work single-handed for four or five years, and, of course, I could not pay all the attention possible to subjects that we were supposed to teach at the time, with the result that Mr. McMillan found serious fault with grammar. I was threatened to be reprimanded if there was not an improvement. I had 91 pupils to teach myself, and I may tell you that the school was built for the ordinary attendance of that particular locality, and 40 would be about the average, but in two years I raised the average from 40 to over 70.

20858. The CHAIRMAN.—That is the most important thing you have had to tell us about the faults that you have had to find with inspectors. Have you anything else—you say you have serious reason to find fault with the inspectors?—Of course, in my position as President of the Irish National Teachers' Organisation I get numerous complaints.

20859. You have told us distinctly that of the 25 you have met there were only two that you received any help from as a teacher?—Yes, that is my evidence.

20860. And then you went on to complain distinctly against Mr. McMillan?—Against Mr. McMillan.

20871. Mr. HASKY.—Have you any other personal complaint against any other inspectors?—Mr. McMahon was a man I got a complaint against in connection with our organisation work at one time, to show how discontent is felt in our district.

20872. In the Limerick or the Clare district?—Limerick and Clare are in one circuit.

20873. The CHAIRMAN.—What were you going to say about that?—I was just going to say that a young lady was dismissed by the managers.

20874. You were illustrating the wide range of discontent, I think?—Yes, and the reason of the discontent is that appeals are futile and of no value whatever, and that we bear the treatment given to us, our appeals and everything else, simply because we can get no redress.

20875. In what year were you President of the Irish National Teachers' Organisation?—1911-12.

20876. Now, it was in that year when you were President that you had opportunities of learning about the general discontent that prevails throughout Ireland?—Yes, and not that year alone, but in that year all the complaints would come to me.

20877. I may assume that your position as president gave you a very rare opportunity of knowing of cases in Ireland. That is what you mean?—Yes.

20877A. And it was during the year 1911 that you got that information?—1911 to 1912.

20878. You preceded Miss Mahon?—Yes, just the year before. She succeeded me.

20879A. And was it at the teachers' meeting that you got that impression of the feeling of the teachers?—Oh, no, sir; we get correspondence from teachers all over the country asking for advice, for instance, about disagreements with inspectors, and we have to give them support in various ways. This teacher who applied to me asked for protection, and this inspector went to her school.

20879B. What were you going to tell us about that?—This young lady taught in Clare. Her management, without any grave fault, gave her three months' notice of dismissal. In the course of the advice that I was giving to the young lady I asked her to appeal to this inspector to come and examine her school, to show that she was not an inefficient teacher. What does he do? On the very day he was going out to examine he brought a candidate for the position on the car.

20880. He was coming to inspect this school to see whether the lady was efficient or not?—Yes.

20881. And that very day he brought a candidate for the position?—Yes, it is so.

20882. And you want that to go on the minutes?—Well, it is a fact.

20883. Was that Mr. McMahon?—Mr. McMahon.

20884. And did he hold an examination as to this lady's efficiency?—While he was on his way to conduct the examination of this young lady he dropped the candidate at the house of the managers and went on to the school from there.

20885. The Broom or Ross?—And was the result of the examination that the lady was dismissed?—Yes, the lady was dismissed, not as a result of the examination.

20886. And the other lady got the school?—Yes. We had a law suit about it, tried before County Court Judge Bodkin. Judge Bodkin questioned the managers for a long time, and gave judgment in favour of the teacher, and the former lady appealed against it. It was tried by Chief Justice O'Brien and he upset the decision of Judge Bodkin. We had two inspectors examined, Mr. McNeill and Mr. McMahon.

20887. The CHAIRMAN.—And finally the managers won?—Yes, on a technical point.

* Mr. GEORGE RAMSAY, Cockstown, Co. Tyrone, Representative of the Irish National Teachers' Organisation, Member of the Central Executive Committee, examined.

20888. The CHAIRMAN.—What is the name of your school?—Oldtown Boys', Cockstown.

20889. And you have been principal of that for 24 years?—Yes.

20890. You say the average attendance in that school is 88.5?—Yes, sir, 88.5.

20891. And that you were trained in the Church of Ireland Training College in 1881 and 1882?—Yes.

20892. You were assistant teacher for four years, and you have been principal of a school for 26 years?—Yes.

20893. Now, you have been 24 years in your present school. Where were the other two years passed?—I was two years principal and four years as assistant.

20894. Where were you two years as principal?—In Coeshill.

20895. So you have served under the National Board altogether 30 years?—Yes.

20896. And what is your grade now?—Second grade.

20897. Second grade under the new system?—Yes.

20898. You have given us a list of the merit marks you have obtained since 1908, and they are a series of ten "very good" unbroken except that there is one "excellent" in 1904?—That is correct.

20899. All from 1908 to 1915 "very good" except that there is one "excellent" in 1904?—Yes.

20900. Now we come to your statement. You say: "With 30 years' service, classed first of second for 28 years, a record of highly efficient service since 1900, a priority to promotion to younger teachers of a shorter service, seeing he only wanted four months of a prescribed age laid down in an antiquated rule and that he went through a course of training"—Yes.

20901. Mr. HASKY.—You make no distinction between a recognised training college and one that is not recognised?—The rule of the year 1887 runs this way:—No

30th July, 1918.]

Mr. GEORGE RAMSEY examined.

[Continued.]

teacher under 25 years of age can be promoted to first class if not trained in a recognised training college, except those who were in the service prior to 1st August, 1887, and were on that date 25 years of age, or, if they happened to be under 25, were married. I happened to be four months under this.

20002. The CHAIRMAN.—And that depressed you?—And that depressed me, although my neighbour who is just at the exact age can go to the top of the ladder. I refer there to a Belfast teacher who happened to be 26 years of age, and he is now in the first grade. He was never trained and he is in the first of first grade.

20003. He satisfies the requirements of the rule?—He satisfies the requirements of the rule; he was just past the age.

20004. But you did not satisfy the requirements precisely?—I did not satisfy them precisely because I happened to be four months under age.

20005. So that you received an answer on the 23rd November, 1909, from the Commissioners saying: "In view of the fact that Mr. Ramsey is not recognised as 'trained' and not in a position to claim the privilege accorded to certain untrained teachers by rule 103(b) of the Commissioners' Code, it is regretted that promotion cannot be granted in his case." That is your complaint, that you got that answer?—Yes. The Commissioners themselves recognise special promotion, and they do specially promote teachers, and I do not see why they should not have promoted me when I gave such a length of service, although I am not recognised as trained in their eyes, seeing that there are a great many untrained teachers in first of first grade.

20006. Mr. HENRY.—You are not strengthening your case by making a statement which is not accurate. You say you were trained in the Church of Ireland Training College. Excuse me, you were not. The Church of Ireland Training College did not exist as the Church of Ireland Training College till 1884?—I said "non-government." It was under non-government control at the time.

20007. It was not called the Church of Ireland Training College?—It was. We called it that at the time, Church of Ireland Training College, Killara Street. We always called it that.

20008. It was called the Killara Place Training College, and the Church Education Societies' Training College, but it got the title of Church of Ireland Training College when it was opened in connection with the National Board in 1884?—We called it the latter at the time.

20009. The CHAIRMAN.—Would you like to substitute the words the Church Education Societies' Training College, Killara Place?—I am satisfied with that. The Commissioners say: "In schools with an average from 50 to 60, six consecutive 'very good' reports and at least 15 years' service entitle a teacher to special promotion." They do not qualify that rule with anything about training at all, and that is their rule. They say that in schools with an average of 50 to 60, six "v.g.'s," and 15 consecutive years' service, entitle the teacher to it. I had 11 consecutive "very good" reports and 30 years' service.

Mr. CORRY.—I think you have a very good case for promotion.

20010. The CHAIRMAN.—Has it not been refused?—I do not wish to dwell at any further length on my statement; I only put it in.

20011. Mr. HENRY.—It is unquestionably a good case?—A typical case. It is typical, because I know in Ireland at present a lot of teachers similarly circumstanced are kept out of special promotion.

20012. The CHAIRMAN.—At any rate that is the strength of your case?—Yes.

20013. Mr. HENRY.—Promotion, whether special or other wise, depends on training, and therefore it was not necessary when giving the conditions on which special promotion would be granted, to go into these things of training, position in school, ability, general attainments, good service, and seniority, since these were binding in the case of promotion of any kind?—Yes.

20014. The CHAIRMAN.—You mention a case of an untrained teacher of long service promoted to first

grade. You quote the case of Mr. Morrison of Belfast, who writes: "I was promoted to first of first grade from April, 1906. I never was trained. I was 26 years old in 1887."—Yes.

20015. Mr. CORRY.—How many months were you under the age?—Four months.

20016. The CHAIRMAN.—That is all you wish to say about your personal case?—That is all.

20017. And what is the amount of your official income now at this moment?—£114 and capitulation.

20018. Coming to about £125?—Coming to about £129; that is the total.

20019. Now, you are going to deal with a number of cases in part two?—Yes. In what way do you desire me to go into those cases.

20020. I am afraid that we cannot go into them except very briefly. You might deal with them in three columns, giving, first, the date of the examination, then the name of the inspector, and then the merit mark assigned to the school on that examination or inspection. Can you supply us with that with regard to a certain number of these schools?—Yes, I have a full statement of my own here in book form, a concise statement.

20021. Of all those cases?—Of all those cases. (Witness hands in statement). Now, I should like to refer personally to another case. It is numbered 2 on the process, a case in which the teacher was compelled to leave his country, after six years of efficient service, without reward. This teacher is Wilson Hanna, of Ballygally, Co. Kerry, who left Ireland for Canada, and I had a letter from him last week. I did not write to him at all, but he wrote after five or six years, and in speaking about his experience in Canada he referred to the school that he had been in in Ballygally, and he gave me the reports for the school in this order—"fair," "good," "fair," "good," "good," "fair," "fair," "good." I have since that got the record from the present teacher of the school, so Mr. Hanna was correct in his marks. Mr. Hanna pointed out that "fair" always came on the third year, depriving him of his increment, and then at the end of six years he left in the year 1906. He said in his letter: "Thank Goodness for the 'fair' that made me disgusted with the system of promotion in Ireland."

20022. Mr. CORRY.—He had been treated so well in Canada?—He had been treated so well in Canada.

20023. The HONORABLE MEMBER.—Is he teaching in Canada?—Teaching in Canada, in Saskatchewan; and he goes on to say how well he flourishes there.

20024. "Fair" came in at the third and sixth year?—There was always a "fair" when he had two "goods" and he got disgusted.

20025. And it came in at the end of the sixth year?—Yes.

20026. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, with regard to your list of cases, I understand that you are going to take certain typical cases, and then to bring in illustrations of them?—Yes.

20027. What is the first?—This is the case of Mr. D. H. Maguire, B.A., who is principal of St. Malachy's School, Coleraine. He was teaching in the Co. Down, in Antrim, where he was appointed in the year 1894, and he got "very good," "good," "good," "middling."

20028. What year did the "middling" come in?—1908. Is it necessary to give the inspectors' names?

20029. It is no harm?—Well, Mr. McMillan was the inspector who gave "middling"; and he examined them also in Irish, and this is a most emphatic point. I think, because the inspector wrote that the teacher should get no fees in Irish. He appealed, and on another came, Mr. Faulkner, and he reported as follows:

"Reading in standard three is pretty accurate but a little slow. Conversation is good. Standard six are very good at reading, translation, and conversation." The teacher got his fees.

20030. He got his fees on the organiser's report?—On the organiser's report; and that was the year the school got "middling." And in the same year he got full fees for geometry, for which Mr. McMillan gave him the mark "very good," and that appears to be inconsistent with the "middling" for the school.

30th July, 1915.]

MR. GEORGE EMMY EXAMINED.

(Continued.)

20081. Does that finish Mr. Maguire's case?—Yes, I want to draw your attention now to some schools that are done out of a year's increment owing to no examination being held for one year.

20082. Owing to the dropping of examination for one year?—Yes. I have the case of a man called James Houston who got "good" and "good" for 1911 and 1912, and in 1913 there was no examination.

20083. Mr. HENLY.—When you speak of 1908 do you refer to the school year or the calendar year?—To the calendar year.

20084. Were there examinations in each successive school year?—At that time there was the calendar year. For a number of years running, examinations were always held in the calendar year. During the last four or five years they are holding them now later in the school year, but at first they were not; they were held every year in the calendar year. The point is that by delaying the examination the consequence is that increment is delayed.

20085. The CHAIRMAN.—Did he get it in the next year?—He did not get anything at all, because the report was "fair."

20086. The BISHOP OF ROSA.—When was that report, was it in the Autumn?—August 12th, 1904, was his next examination.

20087. And the former examination?—August 7th, 1902.

20088. Mr. HENLY.—He might have an examination in each school year?

20089. The BISHOP OF ROSA.—A year was lost?—A year was lost.

20090. The CHAIRMAN.—And he lost his chance of increment?—He did, sir.

20091. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—What was his mark in the year before the year that was dropped?—"Good," 1902 and 1903 were "good" and 1904 was "fair."

20092. The CHAIRMAN.—1903 was the dropped year and 1904 "fair"?—Yes.

20093. Mr. HENLY.—What grade is he in?—He is only in third grade. He seeks promotion to second grade from 1903. Now he has got 1905 "good," no examination in 1906, 1907, "good," and then he is dropped to "fair" again, 1908, that is another year, and then he got "good" the following year, and he is dropped to "fair" again.

20094. The CHAIRMAN.—Who drops him to "fair"?—The first time it was Mr. Little dropped him to "fair," and the second time it was Mr. Chambers. Chambers is the senior and Little the junior. Now, I have another case of the same kind, No. 7.

20095. Owen Jordan?—Yes, a good teacher. He stood the school average of 12 to 13, and he cannot get promotion to second grade after 18 years' service owing to the lowering of his reports.

20096. Will you tell us about these reports?—Yes, sir. He had no record in 1906. Mr. Martin, the inspector at that time, examined but left no record. Perhaps as Mr. Martin now is dead I ought not to refer very much to him, but he was suffering from disease at that time, and I think there was some examination then held, but there was no record of that examination and no merit mark, and so the teacher missed everything.

20097. That amounted to no examination in that year?—It did not count.

20098. What I want particularly to dwell upon is that the office acts, not upon the efficiency of the school, but upon the merit mark. They have some kind of a rule about merit marks. In 1907 he got "fair," in 1908 he got "good," and in 1909 he got "good." Then 1910?—In 1910 he got nothing; there was no examination in 1910.

20099. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—No examination in 1906 or in 1910?—Oh, I beg your pardon, there was an examination in 1909, but no record.

20100. Mr. HENLY.—Does 1910 mean that there was no examination in the school year?—One was November the 17th, 1909, and then the following was July the 15th, 1911. That would not account for the school year. Next he got "fair," "fair," "fair," then he got no chance; after he got three "fair," and he is seeking for promotion to second grade.

20101. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you any other instances or do you not think that these would illustrate that best sufficiently?—There is this one, No. 17.

20102. The BISHOP OF ROSA.—Would you bring your case down to this point, that these are the only cases you know of?—Oh, they are not the only cases I know of, but they are illustrations.

20103. But if you persist in giving the whole of this list then you leave the impression that you have put before us all the cases that you could gather?—Oh, there are others.

The CHAIRMAN.—The Bishop means that your evidence will be a great deal stronger if you give us specimens well chosen.

20104. The BISHOP OF ROSA.—For illustrations, three or four are as good as fifteen or sixteen, and if you give fifteen or sixteen you leave a reader under the impression that you gave all the cases that you could gather?—I see. Well, I go on to the second head. I just want to refer to a visit of Dr. Starke.

20105. The CHAIRMAN.—As to the effect of Dr. Starke's visit?—The effect of Dr. Starke's visit. This teacher is No. 6 on the list, Nell M'Loughlin, Scarvo School, Merville, 1st Class, Grade III., in 1900. The teacher has been deprived of increment since 1907 owing to the lowering of the report. Dr. Starke visited his school. I will read this statement of the teacher. He does not give the date of the visit. It was in 1909:—"In 1909 I got 'good' from Mr. Kyle, and five months later 'fair' from the same inspector. I asked my manager to have a re-inspection, but it fell through. In the meantime Dr. Starke, with the aid of inspection, Mr. Hynes, called."

20106. That was about 1910?—Teacher further says: "He examined my division on reading, and inspected the composition, which he lavishly praised, and the drawing, and he said the report 'fair' was unjust."

20107. Dr. Starke said that?—Yes; these are the words of M'Loughlin that I am reading to you: "And he called Mr. Hynes' attention to it, and he said the work was really well done. I told him I lost my increment over it and he took a note of what I said, and Mr. Hynes told me that I would certainly get my increment, but I did not, and I later reminded Dr. Starke of his visit and his remarks and asked him to do me justice. The reply was that I could not get my increment as the school did not deserve it." That is all I have to say about that. The next case I wish to refer to are cases where the merit mark sometimes of the principal or assistant is interfered with by the merit mark of the school. I mean that the assistant might have his or her mark lowered owing to the merit mark of the school, and that the principal might lose owing to the school not getting "very good" on account of the merit mark of the assistant.

20108. Mr. HENLY.—But is not the assistant paid or awarded increment on his own merit mark?—I thought so; but it appears from some of those cases that it affects the principal; for instance, in that case just referred to of M'Loughlin, he got "fair." That was the year that Dr. Starke visited him. That year, August, 1906, he got "fair," and it was after that that Dr. Starke's visit took place. The inspector says the assistant's work was of a moderate nature. I am pointing out that that interfered with the merit mark of the school.

20109. The CHAIRMAN.—That is that the assistant pulled the merit mark of the school down?—Pulled the merit mark of the school down.

20110. Mr. HENLY.—But the assistant's increment depends on his own personal mark, and not on the mark of the school?—It does lately, but I don't know whether it did at first or not.

20111. I thought you said you had instances to prove that the assistant suffers from the mark of the school. This was where the principal suffered owing to the mark of the assistant?—I think I have a case of what you refer to.

20112. We have had instances of the other, and we are quite clear about that, but what we want is where the assistant suffered not by his own fault?—Well, No. 93.

20113. Mr. CORRY.—I do not quite understand this reference to No. 6.—Teacher deprived of increment since 1907, owing to lowering of report, due probably to inefficient old teacher, assistant now on pension?—

Yes, because in 1910 he got a report in which the inspector says the principal's division is above and the assistant's below that standard—that is the fair mark. I am quoting the observations of the inspector.

20954. And was no inefficient?—Here is what the inspector says—"Principal's division above, assistant's below, that standard."

20955. The CHAIRMAN.—It was the assistant pulled the mark down?—Yes.

20956. The BISHOP or ROSS.—The assistant was an old teacher?—Yes.

20957. But there is no evidence there that even the principal's own merit mark was up to "good." All that is said is that it is above "fair"?—In 1911 a recent inspector referred to it in this way:—"The principal's teaching shows intelligence; the assistant's is only middling." The assistant's teaching was unsatisfactory, and he gave the mark "fair" there again.

The BISHOP or ROSS.—There is really no conclusive evidence that the principal did not get it on his own account.

20958. The CHAIRMAN.—What was the merit mark given for the year before?—It was "good" for 1909. There were five consecutive goods from 1905 to 1909.

20959. Mr. HENLY.—But I think we have evidence that the principal sometimes suffers from the work of his assistant. Now, you want to mention the case of an assistant deprived of his increment?—Yes, an assistant deprived of his increment. This is the case Edward D—, of — school, —, Co. Donegal. This assistant was deprived of his increment in 1910, and the school got "fair."

20960. Did he lose his increment because the school got "fair"?—I cannot tell, but he lost his increment.

20971. The BISHOP or ROSS.—Did the assistant get a personal merit mark of "very good" or "good" and lose his increment on account of the school getting fair?—Of course, we cannot tell the merit marks of the principal or the assistant individually, because they were not supplied to the teachers.

20972. Then you see your reasoning is faulty; you cannot prove anything?—I can prove what the merit mark of the school was.

20973. That it was "fair"?—Yes.

20974. And then the natural inference is that the merit marks of the principal and assistant were both "fair"?—No.

20975. The CHAIRMAN.—But you cannot prove that the teacher or assistant teacher has suffered by reason of the merit mark?—Well, I go on to the next case, where the school building or other things interfered with the mark as well as the efficiency.

20976. That is that they were made to count against the teacher?—Yes.

20977. And against the mark of the school?—Yes.

20978. Mr. HENLY.—Give us the most recent case of that if you can?—I will give a case.

20979. The BISHOP or ROSS.—What year was that?—1908, the 11th of June, 1908. Mr. Clements has done that in his report which I have here. On the 11th of June, 1908, Mr. Clements wrote as part of his report on the school these words:—"As the schoolhouse and premises are in good order, and the schoolrooms well furnished and equipped for teaching purposes, I classify the school as 'very good.'"

20980. The CHAIRMAN.—He gives that as his reason for giving the mark "very good"?—Yes.

20981. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Is that in the report or in the observation book?—That is in the report which came down on the 12th June, 1908—"On the whole, a large amount of useful educational work is at present being done here. I should like the teachers to pay more attention to the pupils of the lowest standards. More than half the pupils are enrolled in the infants' and first standard rolls. The teachers should aim at having a much larger senior division. The pupils are inclined to talk, too, at desk work. As the schoolhouse and premises are in good order, the schoolrooms well furnished and equipped for teaching purposes, and as I expect the teachers to improve the character of their work, I classify this school as 'very good.'"

Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—That is a most extraordinary report.

20982. Mr. HENLY.—Well, Mr. Clements was a peculiar inspector?—He was, indeed, very.

20983. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, go on with that head of cases in which you say the merit mark awarded has been owing to the state of the premises?—There is No. 10. That is the case of Mr. William Diver, of Killybegs, Co. Donegal. Mr. Newell was the inspector, and he gave the school "fair." He examined the school in 1910, and he writes:—"I cannot see my way to describe the general condition of the school as higher than 'fair,' though the work done by each of the teachers is on the whole 'good,' and he describes the state of the building as one that renders satisfactory results quite impossible, and the lighting as poor, and the desks utterly unsuitable for writing on."

20984. You say the bad state of the buildings was taken into account?—Yes, it was taken into account and interfered with the merit mark, and therefore interfered with the increment of the teacher.

20985. The BISHOP or ROSS.—The merit mark was "fair"?—Yes.

20986. But he says that the work of each teacher was good?—He does.

20987. What year was that?—1910.

20988. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Who was the inspector?—Mr. Newell. I have another report here from Dr. Beatty in 1905, where the school got "fair," and he referred to the state of the school buildings.

20989. The BISHOP or ROSS.—He is bound, of course, to refer to the school buildings?—But we want that to be reported to the proper authorities, not to the teacher.

The BISHOP or ROSS.—But he reports to the manager, not to the teacher.

20990. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—The manager is the proper authority, and everything is reported to the manager?—But really these things the teacher should have nothing to do with.

The CHAIRMAN.—You must be able, as in the first case, to connect the two things together.

Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—The only way to do that would be by comparing the mark with the remarks in the report on the teaching, showing that the teaching was very good.

20991. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you any other instances?—Yes.

20992. What name?—Henry E. Thompson, of Ardara School, Co. Derry. He seeks promotion, and is debarred owing to the merit mark, although the reports of inspectors appear to be at variance with the mark. He got "good" on the 15th of November, 1909, and the inspector wrote in the observation book these words:—"Had school not been closed for two months, owing to building operations, probably a higher mark would have been secured." Of course, he does not directly refer to the school building, but he does refer to another matter. He does not exactly show that the school building interfered with the report, but that something else did outside the teacher's control.

20993. The point is, that it is on the state of the buildings that the inspector bases the merit mark, but in this case it is the re-building?—Yes.

The CHAIRMAN.—It does not show that the character of the building influenced the merit mark.

20994. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—It illustrates another point, however, and that is that the teacher was taken at a disadvantage at the time of the inspection, and that due allowance was not made for it. That would come in under another head?—I am going on to the next case. That is a case of scrappy inspection.

20995. The CHAIRMAN.—That is No. 11, Edward McGlinchy, of Doonagh School, Ballykerry. These are the remarks of the teacher:—"Increment delayed twelve months, as the result of an inspection lasting about 1½ hours one evening and about 20 minutes the following morning; no examination, except a few questions in history and geography, and full dues for algebra and Irish the same year. Irish marked 'excellent' by the organizer. One pupil passed the King's Scholarship, second division, and another third division. That was the year the school got 'fair,' 1909." That is what you call a scrappy examination?—Yes, it lasts one evening and 20 minutes the following morning.

20th July, 1913.]

MR. GEORGE RAMSAY CHAIRMAN.

[Continued.]

20996. **Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.**—Do you know of examinations carried on beyond school hours?—Well, I could give an instance of my own.

20997. Is it common?—Oh, it is common.

20998. And the scholars are detained all the time?—They are.

20999. And they are expected to be alert and fit and answer well?—I had to protest against an examination carried on to 4 o'clock, and I said I would not allow it to go on any further.

21000. **The CHAIRMAN.**—Have you any other cases of scrappy examination?—That of Mr. James Mulhern, Letterick, Co. Donegal.

21001. There is nothing about scrappy information there?—Here is what another teacher says, and I thought it would be well to take down this:—"Inspected by Mr. Smyth on the 8th of November, 1909, on the first day that the school opened after three weeks' vacation. A snow-storm prevented the inspector from going any further, and he insisted on inspecting, though only 27 pupils out of 60 were present. Again, on the 28th of September, 1910, Mr. Smyth inspected the school in my absence as principal teacher. I was laid up with appendicitis. The school closed that afternoon for a fortnight, and when the school opened again on the 17th of October Mr. Smyth was present at 10 o'clock, and continued the inspection, which he said he had left unfinished on the previous occasion."

21002. We had one or two instances of that yesterday?—On the 17th of July Mr. Glaser held the actual inspection, though the school opened that day after vacation, and examined classes in the work of the standards, to which they had only been promoted that morning.

21003. That would seem to me to come under another head, as examination at a time when the pupils were not prepared for it?—Perhaps so.

21004. That is a very common complaint?—I may say that I hastily prepared these cases, knowing that you were pressed for time.

But you see that these come under that other head, that is examination at a time when the pupils could not be expected to know the work.

21005. **Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.**—And you have given an instance of that before?—Yes.

21006. **The CHAIRMAN.**—Have you any more?—I will give you one more. P. Magrath, Shewinstown, Co. Tyrone. Here is what he says:—"The day before the last inspection I received the usual notice to be filed up, and the following day I had the inspection. Of course, the returns were not filed when asked for by the inspector."

21007. I do not know under what head that would come?—I don't know what head it would come under; but there is that other case of scrappy examination where a man examined a school the day the school was closed, and finished the examination the day after it was re-opened.

21008. That is the meaning you attach to scrappy?—It is not the meaning I attached to it. I thought you meant that a man, instead of taking a good range for examination, took only one or two particular things and then ran away?—No.

21009. **The HONORABLE MEMBER.**—What you mean is disconnected examination?—Yes, perhaps "disconnected" would be a better word. Sometimes from reading a report you would imagine that the inspector's merit mark would be at variance with the general report. I do not know whether it would be of any use to give you examples of that. In my own estimation, at least, it would.

21010. **The CHAIRMAN.**—That is legitimate, and we have had instances of it, and perhaps you will give us one or two instances?—There is the case of Mrs. Davidson, of Conrathgahan. She was examined in 1912 by Miss Kelly.

21011. What was the merit mark?—"Fair." That was 1912.

21012. Now compare the report with the merit mark?—"The personal is earnest, and the proficiency of the senior pupils is in several subjects good."

The HONORABLE MEMBER.—That would be useless without the whole report, because the junior classes might be very bad.

21013. **The CHAIRMAN.**—That will not prove anything?—I took this from the general report. I only put in what I considered the good points. I now refer to No. 5.

21014. What name?—James Houston, of Conroy School, Co. Donegal. He lost his increment purely owing to reduction of the merit mark.

21015. But the point is the conflict between the report and the merit mark?—Yes, sir. The extract that I have here is—"The teachers are earnest" (they have two teachers); "the school shows fair progress."

21016. What was the merit mark?—The merit mark was "fair," and it was "fair" before that, and it showed progress; yet he put down "fair" again. But I withdrew the cases where the reports are at variance with the merit mark, because I have not got the full reports.

21017. A more extract from the report would not be taken as proof at all?—No.

21018. **Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.**—You would want to have the whole report, and then you ought not to take any case that is not strong?—Very well. Now, there is the question of the discrepancy of inspectors.

The CHAIRMAN.—That is another head.

21019. **Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.**—Perhaps I might make a remark. Have you many cases of alleged discrepancy?—I have a few here.

Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—When you complain of the discrepancy between a merit mark and the report you can look at something that is written, but when there is a verbal statement of somebody saying that there was discrepancy a statement at second hand is of very little use.

21020. **The CHAIRMAN.**—And it involves this, that it makes certain charges against an inspector which he might have a right to rebut. Have you personal knowledge of it, but I will not refer to it because the inspector is dead; but I have several other instances of discrepancy.

21021. **Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.**—Did you see it?—I understand your point. Your point is that the inspector might challenge it.

21022. **Mr. CONROY.**—It may be something that somebody told you?—This is a statement here from the teacher. The teacher gives it as his statement.

It would be quite enough to state that the teachers stated several instances of discrepancy.

21023. **The CHAIRMAN.**—We have several cases in which teachers alleged that the inspector was rude, and we have seen the assertions of the inspector that he was not conscious of being rude at all?—But where an inspector ordered a teacher to take off his hat, and sat all day with his own hat on his head, it was not very courteous, and that is the teacher's statement. There is one case I should like to refer to in connection with discrepancy, that is the case of Mr. H. A. Mcnamara, of Moyola School, Castlebarrow, Co. Kerry.

21024. That is a case of untimely visit?—This is an instance in which the teacher was charged by the inspector with discourtesy, and I want to point out how the Board censured the teacher, and the manner in which they investigated the matter. The teacher is charged with discourtesy, and I have an extract from the report.

21025. What is the date?—The report of the inspector is dated the 19th of December, 1911.

21026. Let us hear what it was and begin at the beginning. Was the inspector holding an inspection?—He came into the school. I don't know whether he was holding an inspection or not. What the inspector says is—"When I called the principal teacher was correcting exercises in the schoolroom and not engaged in teaching. The pupils were, however, usefully employed, except, perhaps, one division—third and fourth standards—who were in the class-room by themselves, and were, not unnaturally, somewhat noisy, and some of them idle, there being no assistant with them; the assistant was teaching drawing in the schoolroom. After walking round, and observing how the classes were employed, and noting that the time-table arrangements were not being observed, I asked the principal teacher whether the Christmas examinations were in progress, thinking that the exercises at which he was correcting, and which were on detached sheets, might

30th July, 1912.]

Mr. GEORGE RAMSAY examined.

[Continued.]

have been examination or test exercises. He answered in the negative, but said that he was writing and converting those exercises for exhibition to the parents at a school fest to be held on Friday, 29th instant. I made an comment except to ask incidentally whether he was in the habit of preserving the written work done at the regular June and December examinations for inspection. However, before leaving, having asked him to come up to the teacher's desk at the end of the room (he had been sitting at a table near the front desk where we would have been within hearing of the pupils), I said to him quietly that I thought this correction of exercises would be better done before or after school hours, especially when there was such a large number of them to be corrected, and that I thought the school fest, which was not to take place for over a week, should not be allowed to disorganise the time-table arrangements. He immediately replied in an offensive and aggressive tone, that he thought he might be allowed to exercise his own 'goodness' in a matter of this kind. I objected to his unkind manner and his remarks, which virtually put me on the defensive, and said so. After a few further remarks he reminded me that he had it in his power to write to the Secretaries, and I told him that he was, of course, at liberty to take any action that he wished. He was inclined to prolong the discussion, but as I had a train to catch, and was glad of an opportunity of cutting short an unpleasant altercation, I left, asking him to put any further remarks he had to make in writing. As I was leaving, and some distance from him, he again reminded me in a loud voice that it was open to him to write to the Secretaries. I received the accompanying letter from the teacher next day. There is not the slightest justification for his allegation that I acted in such a way as to degrade him in the eyes of his pupils. I was most scrupulously particular to avoid doing so. I made him good afternoon when I entered the room, but did not engage him in conversation at once. He was at work, and it was my business to see how the work of the school was going on. I certainly did question the divisions and the assistant about the work at which they were engaged, according to my usual custom. He was not in charge of any class, and I did not think it necessary then to disturb him at the work at which he was engaged. Nothing I did could possibly be interpreted as a slight on the principal teacher, and I was most particular when I had to find fault, or, at least, to criticise the arrangements, to do it out of the hearing of the pupils.

21027. Mr. CORRY.—Who was the inspector?—Mr. Ginter. The teacher wrote the following letter to the inspector. This letter that I am going to read to you was forwarded to the Office, and what I want to point out is this:—The teacher wrote to the inspector with regard to the discourtesy of the letter, or the way in which he had conducted himself while he was in the school, and the inspector sent on the teacher's remarks to him, together with his own remarks, to the office, and the Board censured the teacher without asking the teacher for any further explanation. This is the inspector's report to the Board, and the teacher's rejoinder to the inspector.

21028. The point of your evidence in connection with this is that the teacher was not called on for any explanation?—He was not. He was censured on his own letter to the inspector.

21029. Sir HIRSH WINSTON.—Perhaps his own letter justified the censure?—If you like I will read the letter for you, and in my opinion it does not justify the censure:—

"MOTOLA PARK N.E.,

"Cardendrum, 19th December, 1911.

"DEAR SIR,—Relative to your inspection of my school to-day, your hurried departure prevented my drawing your attention to some of the remarks you make in the observation book. These remarks are—(1) That your inspection took place on 19th December, 1911. (2) That the division in the classroom was very noisy. (3) That this division was without supervision. I pass over (1). As (2), I politely beg to state that standards three and four in the class-

room were not noisy. At no time did they disturb the work of the school, nor did I find it necessary to suppress noise during your visit, and had any existed I would certainly have endeavoured to prevent it from becoming unduly observable by you. (3) The supervision given by me to this division was sufficient for the work in which it was engaged. I had allocated a certain amount of work for the half-hour before leaving the classroom; all were within hearing of me, and my eye was upon some of them. I visited the class on two occasions (one of them while you were present) during the half-hour. At the end of the time I tested the work by inspection and by questioning. Now, I would not for a moment presume to question the right of my inspector to write in the observation book any opinion he may hold with regard to my methods, my organisation, my pupils' proficiency, or the condition of my school, but I certainly do object to the remarks I have noted as not being strictly accurate. And I now say that you found my school busy and usefully employed, though (as you note) not in accordance with the time-table. With reference to your charge of impetuosity, I wish to say that I was not knowingly impetuous. But, on the other hand, I have reason to ask my authorities if an inspector may by his conduct degrade a teacher in the eyes of his pupils. When you entered my school I rose to receive you, but you passed on to my desk as if I did not exist. You saw that the pupils were at work other than that specified on the time-table, and instead of asking me for an explanation, you continued to ignore my existence, and questioned in turn my senior division, my middle division, and my assistant, and only then did you consider it necessary to recognise that I existed. Thus not only did you not observe the ordinary civilities, but you immediately proceeded to put me on my trial for a breach of the regulations, by making my pupils witnesses for the prosecution. I have written of this length because I feel aggrieved at the tenor of your remarks, which cannot fail to impress my manager and my own official visitor with the idea that on this occasion at least my school was completely disorganised, disorderly, and without proper supervision, all of which would be misleading.—I am, dear Sir, yours faithfully,

"H. A. MACGREGAR."

The following letter was received from the Education Office, dated 22nd April, 1912:—

"REV. SIR,—I am directed by the Commissioners of National Education to furnish you with the accompanying extract from the Inspector's report of his visit to the above-named school on the 19th December, 1911, and also with a copy of a letter from the teacher regarding the same visit, and I have to request that you will censure the teacher, Mr. Macgregar, for his discourtesy to the Inspector, and inform him that a repetition of such action on his part will entail serious consequences. I have also to request that you will instruct Mr. Macgregar to observe the time-table arrangements strictly in future.—I am, Rev. Sir, your obedient servant,

"W. J. DELWORTH, Secretary.

"To Rev. J. B. Tarkenton, Castledawson."

21030. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, let us go on to something else?—Sometimes pressure from the manager on the office gets a teacher promoted, and I will give you an instance of that.

21031. Sir HIRSH WINSTON.—That is all right?—What I want to point out is that in order that a teacher may get his reward there must be some other means taken besides the ordinary means.

You want to show that the manager tries to get justice for you?

21032. The CHAIRMAN.—Is it that the effect of the pressure is that teachers who do not comply with the conditions of promotion get it. If you could prove

22d July, 1915.]

Mr. GOSSET RAMSEY examined.

[Continued.]

that it would be a serious matter. Have you any instance where pressure from the manager has obtained promotion for undeserving teachers who had not complied with the conditions, or where pressure from the manager has caused injustice?—Well, I will not put that in. I have an instance of a teacher being able to get increment in England who had not any in Ireland. I had an assistant of mine who went to England, and he was only getting £46 a year with me. That was some years ago. He started in Sheffield at £26, and got increments every year of £2 and £10.

21033. The CHAIRMAN.—Possibly the £26 in Sheffield may not have suited him further than the £26 in—Oh, yes, you can live as cheaply in Sheffield as in Belfast or Corktown.

21034. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you any other instance?—I have some instances of discontent. The discontent of the teachers is spreading. Their own remarks show how dissatisfied they are with the present system.

21035. Mr. HIRSH WILKINSON.—I think that you come from a different district from that from which we have just been taking evidence, and I will put this question to you. From your conversation with teachers in your district do you consider that they are contented or discontented with the present system?—My firm belief is that they are discontented.

21036. The CHAIRMAN.—All round you at Corktown?—Round all the North.

21037. Mr. HIRSH WILKINSON.—You are speaking about the Corktown district?—Well, I know a good deal about Dromedary and Derry and Tyrone, those three counties principally.

21038. And from your intercourse with the teachers of those counties you are prepared to say that there is a strong feeling of discontent?—Oh, there is, and it is principally owing to the fact that their increment and promotion depend on merit marks. That is what I would like to emphasise more particularly; that is my strong point with regard to this inquiry, and I would like to emphasise it, that I believe that it is the merit marks that cause most of the trouble. The increment and promotion of the teachers ought to depend, not on merit marks, but on length of service, and efficiency as teachers, and they ought to come automatically if there is nothing against the teacher seriously.

21039. The CHAIRMAN.—If there is no unsatisfactory report?—If there is no unsatisfactory report.

21040. Mr. HIRSH.—Here is the condition on which increments are awarded in London, which I will read for you—"Annual increments of salary according to scale are allowed for each year of satisfactory service. The annual increment falls due on the first of the month following the anniversary of the teacher's entry into the service." And then there is an explanation—"The phrase 'year of satisfactory service' means a period of twelve months during which the teacher has not been guilty of any grave misconduct." Now, if you could get a regulation of that kind do you think it would satisfy your teachers?—Indeed it would.

21041. And you from your position on the Executive Body of the Teachers' Organisation, of course, have an opportunity of knowing about the feelings of a considerable portion of the teachers?—Yes, I have—of a great number.

21042. Now, do you think the teacher should get notice of the examination or general inspection?—Well, with regard to my view about examination as such, I don't believe in examination.

21043. Apart from the question of whether there should be examination or inspection, do you think that for the general inspection or general examination the teacher should get notice?—I think he ought to get notice if it is to be an annual inspection.

21044. Well, you know you have a general inspection every year?—Well, perhaps, my ideas about inspection are not in keeping with some people's.

21045. Do you think the teacher ought to get notice so as to afford him an opportunity of having all his pupils collected for the occasion?—That is, if it is a formal examination.

21046. I am not talking of examination merely, but even inspection?—Well, for the annual inspection I would think so, but of course there ought to be inspection several times in the year.

21047. I am aware of that. The inspector is supposed to visit three times a year, and one of those visits should be the general inspection, which is the one that I am referring to. I am asking you do you think that for that general inspection the teacher should get notice?—It depends on what depends on that inspection. If it is for the purpose of giving a merit mark in order to get increment and promotion, I would say certainly yes.

21048. And if it is not?—I don't know that it would be necessary.

21049. Do you think it is satisfactory for an inspector to walk in and find 20 pupils in a school where there is an average of 50 or 60?—I would call that very unsatisfactory.

21050. How would that be avoided if you have not notice?—Of course, there is the other side of it too; if it is to be an examination.

21051. I am not using the word "examination." I am using the word "inspection"?—Well, it depends on what depends on the inspection.

21052. Mr. COOPER.—Does not the general report on the work done in the school for the year and the tone of the school depend on it?—Yes.

21053. Do you not think it is then desirable that the teacher should have notice?—Under the present circumstances certainly.

21054. Would you say under all and any circumstances?—Well, if the whole system of increment and promotion were changed it might alter the circumstances very much.

21055. Mr. HIRSH WILKINSON.—If there is going to be an annual inspection, the result of which is to be expressed in words, and the inspector has to write out a judgment with regard to the school, is it not desirable that the inspector, if he does attempt to form a judgment of the school, should form a correct judgment, and can be form a correct judgment of the school if there is not a sufficient number of pupils present for him to see and know about?—You are quite correct, if he comes to the school for that purpose.

21056. That is the purpose that he always comes for now, is it not?—Under the present rules and regulations.

21057. Under any rules. The annual inspection means that the inspector is to give a proper judgment on the school, and can a proper judgment of the school be obtained without a fair number of the pupils being present, and can you secure a fair number of the pupils being present unless some notice is given to the teacher so that in circumstances unforeseen he may make an effort to have those pupils present?—I agree; but I was having in my mind's eye what ordinarily prevails in England and Scotland—the way schools are inspected in England and Scotland.

21058. The CHAIRMAN.—Do you wish your general statement to go in?—I do—

(c) THE ABOLITION OF THE RESULTS SYSTEM.

In 1899 the abolition of the system of payment by Results Fees was hailed with universal satisfaction, and the dawn of brighter days for children and teachers was heralded by all concerned. Regarding the system there can be no two opinions. No one desires to revert again to such a method of award. In the year 1900 teachers were led to believe that, so far as the schools and children were concerned, greater freedom was to prevail, and the relations between teachers and taught were to be such as to make for better citizenship, and a sound solid system of education. The friction existing between inspectors and teachers, caused by the power partially vested in the hands of the former in determining the income of the latter, was to cease. It was believed that slavery and tedium would be things of the past.

20th July, 1935.]

MR. GEORGE RAMSAY EXAMINED.

[Continued.]

In proof of the fact that these views were firmly entertained by the teachers in 1903, I desire to point out that an Essay (copy of which is handed in), read by me at the Dublin Congress of Teachers, was ordered to be printed and circulated as an expression of the teachers' views and opinions at that time.

(b) How THE SYSTEM OF 1903 WORKED OUT.

Inspectors and teachers, long accustomed to a rut of red-tapeism, were slow in most cases to adapt themselves to the newer methods. It was unfortunate that the motto, "Make haste slowly," was not more applied. It would have been better had a gradual evolution of things been permitted. The change should never have involved the hasty abandonment of the prevailing school programmes in force.

The sudden launching of Hand and Eye subjects, Drill, and Elementary Sciences, with the partial re-nomenclature of such subjects as Geography, Grammar, and Agriculture, together with the suggested new methods of teaching arithmetic, Writing, and Drawing, distracted the teachers and caused confusion.

It is to be regretted that the teachers were not consulted in regarding these changes. The Central Executive Committee of the Teachers' Organisation sought for and obtained interviews with the Resident Commissioner, and drafted a series of programmes suitable to the requirements of various classes of schools. They recommended compulsory and optional subjects which would be suitable to small and large schools, town and country. The result was practically nil. The views of the teachers were largely ignored.

Instructions were issued from the Education Office regarding the classification of children, suggesting the ages suitable to the various standards (see Instructions to Inspectors, Report I., page 138). In the carrying out of these instructions, the universal opinion of teachers in recent years is that inspectors are forcing the pace and insisting on the promotion of children beyond first standard at too tender an age.

The great failure of the 1903 system was the substitution of inspection for examination, but inspectors were not freed from the onerous red-tape officialdom of the Education Office, and teachers were not permitted accordingly to exercise sufficient judgment and discretion in the carrying out of the school curriculum. Worst of all, the system of "payment by results" was continued under another form, namely, the award of increments determined by a set of "merit marks" secretly hidden from the teachers. In my opinion this method of award has been the great curse of the present system, and is largely the cause of that want of harmony which should undoubtedly exist between inspector and teacher.

It Mr. Dale's condemnation of the power vested in the hands of inspectors, as pointed out in his voluminous Report of 1905, had been taken as seriously as his suggestions re amalgamation of schools, and financial saving to the British Treasury, the course of subsequent events would have been much altered.

The dependence of teachers for their bread and butter upon the "merit marks" of inspectors at the annual inspection lends itself to treachery, corruption, deceit, and device of all kinds. The favour of the official must be gained at all costs; the teachers, as in the Results Period, must study the inspectors' little facts, quips, and cracks, in order to create a favourable impression. As a result of this hypocrisy, the children are led to see that manners and decorum are dictated with a view to display before some critical authority. Dependent, cringing teachers cannot by any possible means fashion independent and reliable citizens.

(c) SUGGESTED REMEDIES.

1. The first and most essential remedy is to abolish the power vested in the hands of inspectors to determine the "merit mark" of a school or teacher for the purpose of awarding increments and promotions. Let "merit marks" be abandoned.

2. The "grading" of teachers should be abolished. Once a teacher is trained and classified let increments be earned and automatic, and determined by length of service when no serious reprimand is incurred. In this connection I beg to differ with the remarks of Mr. Wynn dealing with resolutions of the Dublin Congress of Teachers (see pages 48 and 49 of Report I.). The teachers have demanded the entire withdrawal of the present grading and promotion methods; but, while doing so, they are compelled to suggest an amelioration of present conditions by offering amendments which would afford some relief under the prevailing circumstances. This, I think, is quite consistent, and accounts for the nature of the Congress resolutions.

3. Encouragement and reward should also be given for increased scholarship of the teacher, or where a greater share of responsibility is realised.

4. A radical change in the training of teachers is needed. Entrance examinations should be stiff, and training course should consist of a thorough preparation for teaching, so that the necessity for flooding the country with paid organisers would cease.

5. The examinations of schools as such should be discouraged, but frequent tests ought to be given by inspectors to determine the efficiency of the instruction imparted.

6. The teaching of Agriculture in country schools might, with advantage, be resorted to; such subjects as Drill, Elementary Science, and even Nature Study, to be dispensed with.

7. Programmes suitable to the various schools should be suggested. Essential subjects, Reading, Writing, and Arithmetic, with one or two optional ones, ought to be sufficient for a one-teacher school. In two-teacher, three-teacher, and larger schools more essential subjects, with a few additional optional ones, should be added.

8. Time Tables. Teachers, with the concurrence of the managers, should be free to adopt any Time Table arrangements they please, and the inspectors, except where in his opinion gross mistakes are made, should merely offer suggestions, but on no account should official sanction be necessary for an arrangement arrived at by the local authority (manager and teacher).

9. Observation Books. Inspectors' observations should partake of encouragement and suggestions. A copy of every Report should be forwarded to the Education Office.

10. Full, and not partial Reports by inspectors should be furnished to managers and teachers.

11. Duplicates of all school documents sent to managers should be supplied to the teacher.

12. Teachers should be permitted to see all "Instructions to Inspectors."

13. Some provision should be made for supplying free books, stationary, and general equipment to schools.

14. Civil Rights. As in the abolition of "merit marks" with the accompanying rewards, so with the concession of full civil liberty, teachers will be more independent and reliable; and when they are allowed to exercise a voice in the welfare of their beloved country, the reaction will be such as to assist in forging a happier, more contented, reliable, and independent rising generation.

I want to emphasise particularly that point about the increment and promotion depending on the merit marks.

Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—I don't think you need emphasise that. You have stated it already clearly enough.

22559. The CHAIRMAN.—What remains?—I should like to emphasise the matter with regard to the time-tables that I have referred to there.

22560. You have a great number of instances of want of uniformity. Do you want to go into that?—I have dealt with some of them here and there, but it would take me too long to go into them all. I was going to go into each case individually; when I heard that you

was finished I jotted down what I thought would come under the different headings before I came into the room, and probably raised it up a bit; but what I wanted to do was to give typical cases.

21061. Is there anything that you were going to add?—I was going to refer to the programme.

21062. On the great topics that come under our terms of reference is there anything that you want to bring before us?—I think a serious thing at the present time that is a cause of irritability is the grading of teachers. I do not think that teachers should be graded at all. They should, as in other countries, start with a certificate entitling a diploma, and after that get their increments, and have no first, second, and third grade, because it seems to me that that is a cause of a great deal of dissatisfaction.

Mr. MARSH LAMBERT, Principal of

Birmingham National School, examined.

21064. The CHAIRMAN.—You are principal of the Boy's National School, Birmingham, Co. Wicklow?—Yes.

21065. You have given an account of yourself under the old system?—Yes, sir.

21066. You were appointed monitor in 1879; trained in St. Patrick's College, Drumcondra, 1883 to 1887; promoted to 2nd of 2nd class on appointment in 1888, and to 1st of 2nd in 1890; to 2nd of 1st in 1891, and to 1st of 1st in 1896. Then you give a list of your inspectors for so many years, and the opinions of the inspectors as to the teacher?—Yes.

21067. Mr. PUNTER says the teacher is earnest, attentive, efficient; Mr. KEENE describes the teacher as hard-working, and the different classes well up to the requirements of their respective programmes; Mr. HODGKIN that the principal of this school is a highly competent and diligent teacher, and Mr. YATES remarks that the school continues to be efficiently conducted?—Yes, sir.

21070. When the new system was introduced in 1900 you underwent a six weeks' course of hand and eye writing under Mr. BEVIS in the Central Model Schools?—Yes.

21071. And then you give extracts from minutes and observations of inspectors. Mr. HYNES, in October, 1900, says: "I am much pleased on the whole with my inspection of this school." This is the same school that you have at present? Oh, yes; I never moved.

21073. He further says: "The teacher is intelligent and painstaking. The pupils are orderly and polite, and show a good deal of enthusiasm. Care and taste are displayed in keeping the school room and premises."—Yes, sir.

21078. And on March 1st, 1901, he says: "Considerable progress has already been made on the lines of the new code."—Yes, sir.

21079. On October 17th, 1900, Mr. MULLEN says: "Work proceeding regularly. The written work of the senior classes very carefully corrected. A very intelligent lesson was delivered in manual instruction."—Yes, sir.

21075. In October, 1901, Mr. THIBBS gives the mark "good."—Yes, sir.

In 1908 Mr. WYSE gives the mark "good," and in 1904 he gives "good" again. In 1905 Mr. CUSACK gives "good." In 1907 Mr. STROUSE gives "good," and he says: "This school is now properly organised, is well conducted, and well taught. The teachers are skilful and successful, and the boys are making good progress in all subjects." In 1908 Mr. CUSACK gives the school "good," and says: "It is conducted with care and the general merit of the work is good. In 1910 Mr. LYONS marks it "good." In 1911 the same inspector gives the mark "good," and says: "Children all very keen indeed, with an excellent spirit of work." In 1912 there was no general inspection during the calendar year. In 1912 Dr. ALEXANDER gave you the mark "good," and said: "The school continues to be conducted with much success. The children are trained to work and due attention is paid to the cultivation of their intelligence." And then you give this from the observation book: "The

21063. The BRIBER or ROSS.—Are the teachers graded in France not in the way we grade them here?—Oh, France is not a model country to copy anything from.

21064. You say other countries. What countries do you mean?—England and Scotland and the Colonies. Speaking of salaries, my son went out to Australia a few months since when he had passed the King's Scholarship examination here, and he can have a salary of £110 to start with in West Australia, Perth.

21065. The BRIBER or ROSS.—What about the difference in the cost of living?—Not very much. Mutton sells at 4d a pound, fruit is very cheap. Clothing is the only article of living that is perhaps a little dear.

people show interest in their work and answer with readiness and intelligence. They have evidently received careful and effective instruction."

21070. Mr. GOWEN.—Have you any personal complaints?—My personal complaint is all with Mr. Dickie.

21077. The CHAIRMAN.—You say: "The foregoing show my record as a teacher and the opinions of the various inspectors that visited and examined my school from time to time during a quarter of a century. I will now deal with the exception, Mr. Dickie. On February 21st, 1902, he visited from 10.45 to 11.10, and wrote in the observation book, 'Work in general very good.' On July 8th, 1902, visited from 11 to 11.10." That is a visit of 10 minutes only?—Yes.

21078. Now, you say in the margin that this is the beginning of the attempt to reduce inefficiency; and you say: "The inspector came in during roll call. Each boy answered 'ad me auge,' and the following dialogue took place between the inspector and the teacher—Inspector—'What are they saying?' Teacher—'Answering their names.' Inspector—'What formulae is that they have?' Teacher—'Each boy says, 'I am here.' Inspector—'But what language is that they are talking?' Teacher—'Irish.' Inspector—'Give me the observation book.' You say that in this he wrote: "I do not think that a roll call should be answered in Irish," and he then turned towards the teacher and said: "Sure that is teaching Irish the whole day?"—Yes, sir.

21079. Then on October 1st and 2nd, 1903, Mr. Dickie, whom you describe as being on the war path, came you say for the annual inspection and examined every individual in English and arithmetic on the results style. At this date there were on the rolls 71, present 69, average 48 and space for 54?—Yes, sir.

21080. Then you say: "On entering the school at 10.10 Mr. Dickie shut two of the four windows, though the school was overcrowded. Secondly, he superseded teacher as regards discipline by shouting out: 'Any boy that talks I'll put him outside the door.' Fourthly, he asked teacher to put a sum in compound proportion on the blackboard. . . . Inspector then made a rush at teacher and shouted out that he did not know what compound proportion was."—Yes.

21081. Sir EMMA WINDHAM.—What do you mean by making a rush at the teacher?—I was at the blackboard and Mr. Dickie was at the table and he rushed over to the blackboard and said: "That is not compound proportion."

21082. He came from the place where he was working to the place where you were standing?—Yes.

21083. And he came in a hurry?—Yes.

21084. The CHAIRMAN.—You say: "Fifthly, inspector shouted out he had an objection to Father Finlay's reading book. Sixthly, inspector asked to be shown the book from which the 5th class worked arithmetic, and on the teacher handing Father Finlay's to him he pitched it with great force towards the teacher, a distance of about 15 feet, and shouted: 'It is too easy' (though it was sanctioned by the Commissioners of National Education). Seventhly, he condemned the time-table in the middle of a class of

children, and the same time-table was drawn up in accordance with the new programme and was examined by five inspectors, including Mr. Dickie himself on two occasions. Eighthly, the inspector refused to examine the work done in science, and said: "Have nothing to do with Heiler's science. It amounted to a course in it don't go; but if you go and get trained in it you need not teach it." Ninthly, inspector shouted to one boy: "Must I learn Irish to speak to you?" and again: "This humming about learning Irish." Read out a boy's composition (about learning Irish), and roared out at the end at the top of his voice: "Rather sanguine!" "Yes, sir. (Composition produced.)

21065. Then you say: "Inspector ordered teacher to procure a supply of Allen's cards, but teacher could not find them on the Board's list. Inspector examined reading and grammar at 4.10 p.m., when the boys had spent 7 hours in school?"—Yes.

21066. Then you say: "Without examining the spelling or composition, inspector threw the papers on the floor, and wrote in the observation book: 'Spelling is unsatisfactory throughout the school. The spelling in the composition was particularly bad.' Teacher next day placed up the papers on which the boys had written their compositions, etc., and after a careful examination found the spelling excellent. A few hours subsequently inspector (who was in girl's school) sent for teacher, and the following dialogue took place:—Teacher—Are you coming back to my school again? Inspector—No. Teacher—I want you back. Inspector—What is the matter now? Teacher—What sort of a report is that you have written? Inspector—I put down the impression of my mind. Teacher—Well, come back till you see it. Inspector then came back to boys' school, and teacher obliged him to read over the compositions written by the boys, and when he had finished he said: "Oh, I'll cancel all that," which he did. Teacher next produced a table showing the percentage of words mis-spelled in the various dictations, and on examining it inspector said: "I'll change that too," which he did by inserting that it was in the 'junior portion of the school' that spelling was bad. This must refer to the infants and 1st standards who were all examined on sinter, and, of course, the writing had been rubbed out, so there was no evidence available?"—Yes.

21067-A. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—You say you told all this to Dr. Stankie when he visited the school in 1911?—Yes.

21068. The HIRSH OF ROSS.—Was Mr. Wyse an inspector in your district?—Yes.

21069. Were you satisfied with him as inspector?—I was, very much, my lord.

21070. He gave you "good"?—Yes.

21071. The CHAIRMAN.—And what did Mr. Dickie drop you to?—"Fair."

21072. Did he ever give you "middling"?—"Fair" the whole time, which knocked out my movement. I have here the roll book of 1902 with the original papers written by all the boys on the day that he said the spelling was bad. (Hands in papers.)

21073. Did he say they were full of mistakes?—He said the spelling was particularly bad.

21074. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—You have already told Mr. Coffey that your reports, except for 1902, 1905, and 1906, when Mr. Dickie examined the school, were "good"?—All "good," by seven different inspectors: I always had a new man.

21075. The CHAIRMAN.—Let me see the observations of Mr. Dickie in the book. 1902 was the first visit?—Yes (book handed to Chairman).

21076. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—When you say that the inspector shouted at you, did he do so in such a fashion that all the pupils could hear?—Oh, yes, oh, yes, he could be heard all over the house, the school room is just 21 by 25 feet, nearly a square, and it is very easy to hear in; but he shouted at the top of his voice.

21078. Where is Mr. Dickie now?—He is in Ennis, county.

21090. The CHAIRMAN.—In 1902 he wrote this in the observation book: "Work in general very good. Some unmet visible in the desk. I do not think that roll call should be answered in Irish except in Irish class."—Yes, sir.

21100. Do you think he had not a right to say that—would not an inspector have a right to say that the roll call should not be answered in Irish except in an Irish class?—I think if a boy answered in Irish, then he should not be punished or the teacher should not condemn it. I certainly would not.

21101. When was the next visit?—He inspected in 1902 again.

21102. Then he wrote: "Reading was fair, writing very good, spelling bad, grammar bad, composition fair, etc., etc., etc." Spelling is very unsatisfactory throughout (and then he inserted before "the school" these words, "the junior portion of.") Then the entry: "Spelling of the composition was particularly bad" is obliterated?—Yes, and I got him to initial that.

21103. What was his next year?—1906, the year I expected my increment. This is signed J. Dickie, 8th August, 1906. He says: "Grammar untaught. Stricter discipline might be maintained."

21104. Mr. COFFEY.—What did he mean by saying grammar was untaught?—It was because I taught according to the programme for teaching analysis, to take the subject, predicate and object. Mr. Stronge called in November and I expected my increment at the time, and I asked Mr. Stronge about my increment. He was surprised I had not got it, and he said: "Write to Mr. Wyse in the Education Office," and I wrote to Mr. Wyse and the reply was what you have there.

21105. The CHAIRMAN.—"I have looked up the matter of your increment, and I find it was refused because the report for this year was not satisfactory. Then there are two remarks of Mr. Dickie's: 'Insist on bolder and more distinct reading, more geography and grammar, and above all on thorough arithmetic problem work. Try to get out of old-fashioned methods and also secure stricter discipline. There is too much carelessness about the attitude of most of the pupils.'"—Well, that was on account of Mr. Dickie himself. I had to leave the whole class idle to procure an arm chair for him, and he threw himself down in the arm chair and did nothing for some time and the boys in the upper seat were unemployed and it was his own fault. 1909 was the next report. He held the examination immediately after vacation.

21106. In August, 1909, he gave you "fair"?—He says: "The school at the time of my inspection had only recently reassembled after vacation, but making every allowance for this fact I am much dissatisfied with the proficiency shown."

21107. Mr. COFFEY.—I suppose you have no doubt in your mind that if Mr. Dickie continued to inspect the Blessington schools you would have been forced out as inefficient?—I have no doubt whatever, and I could know from his talk (I held the proof here in my hands), and from what I heard subsequently that his object was to—

21108. Don't mind that; but I think there is a strong presumption from his always giving you "fair" and the other inspectors "good" that you would have been marked down as an inefficient teacher?—Quite so.

21109. And you think that Irish had something to do with it?—Well, it had; that was the beginning.

21110. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—You had your report reduced to "fair," and that was a reflection on your teaching?—Yes.

21111. But with regard to the financial part of it, did you suffer financially?—Oh, yes, I am suffering £9 a year for nine years.

21112. In consequence of that?—In consequence of Mr. Dickie's visits to the school.

21113. The CHAIRMAN.—Is that all you have to bring before us?—That is all.

FORTY-FIFTH DAY.—TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 2ND, 1913.

At 23, Kildare street; Dublin.

Present:—Sir SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman); Sir HIRAM SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN COPPEY; Mr. HENRAGE E. B. HARRISON; Mr. JEREMIAH HENLY; Mr. WALTER McMURROUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.; Mr. THOMAS MICHAEL KETTLE; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

* Mr. E. MANFIELD, Secretary, Irish National Teachers' Organization, examined.

21114. The CHAIRMAN.—You have been good enough to come here to-day out of your order, and I am very much obliged to you.—Of course, I have no regular statement prepared to-day, but I have a number of points jotted down, and I will do my best.

21115. I am in the difficulty, and other members too, that we do not know exactly what line to go upon. I will begin by asking you the usual formal questions. You were formerly the Principal of Cullen National School?—Yes, and I am at present.

21116. Are you a graduate of a University?—No.

21117. You are Secretary to the Irish National Teachers' Organization?—I am principal of Cullen School, but I am Acting Secretary for the Irish National Teachers' Organization.

21118. Is that the proper description?—Yes.

21119. How long were you Head Master in the Cullen School?—From 1902 until the 15th October last year.

21120. What is your present grade?—The second grade.

21121. How long have you been in the second grade? About three years.

21122. Three years last year?—Yes.

21123. You got your second grade in 1909, shall we say?—It would be on the 1st April, 1909.

21124. What were the numbers in your school last year?—The average would be over 50 for a number of years—three years or so.

21125. You hadn't an average to reach the first grade?—Yes, I had.

21126. I think that is over 50?—Well, the average of the school was over 50; there was an assistant appointed on the 50 average.

21127. Where were you trained?—In Waterford, from 1897 to 1899.

21128. Mr. COPPEY.—At De la Salle?—Yes.

21129. The CHAIRMAN.—You spent two years there?—Yes, I spent five years as monitor; two years in De la Salle, and I came out in 1899. I got first place both years.

21130. Sir HIRAM WILKINSON.—You are not long enough out to be more than second grade?—Unless the rules I would be entitled to first long since. Of course, there were vested rights. My vested rights were ignored altogether on my appointment to the Cullen school.

21131. The CHAIRMAN.—Let us begin at the beginning. Who were your inspectors for 1902?—Mr. Brown and Mr. McEnery.—Mr. Brown was Senior Inspector and Mr. McEnery was District Inspector.

21132. Have you a list of your marks?—Yes.

21133. Will you produce them?—I will give you the reports if you read them.

21134. I want to know your merit marks?—There was a very efficient teacher in the school before me; he was a very competent man; the school was in good condition when I entered it, but the school marks were low.

21135. When you took up the Principalship of the school you received the mark "fair"?—Yes, the school was marked "fair" when I entered it.

21136. What was the mark you got in your first year?—The mark was "fair." I was teaching only four months. Mr. Brown was the Senior Inspector, and said, "The present principal, Mr. Manfield, is doing very good work."

21137. Do you remember the year following?—Yes, the marks were "good" for three years.

21138. For 1903, 1904, and 1905?—Yes.

21139. The mark was "good"?—Yes. In 1906 and 1907 the mark was "very good," in 1908 the report was dropped to "good" by Mr. McEnery; that was the third after two "very good."

21140. Did you lose increment in any way?—At that time I was out in the second grade, and I lost in the way of special promotion.

21141. That was in 1908?—Yes. I have one remark to make in this matter. I believe I was not fairly treated in the lowering of the mark. Science in the school and geography—these two subjects—were given as the reason for lowering.

21142. May I ask you this?—Had Mr. McEnery joined in giving you a higher mark before?—He gave "very good" the two previous years. As regards geography, he examined the notices on a new map which I had just procured at my own expense by direction of the senior inspector, who visited a short time previously. I asked Mr. McEnery to examine on the map of Ireland, or Europe, or any other map in the school, but he seemed inclined to persist in examining on this particular map, with which the children were not acquainted.

21143. Did you expostulate at the time?—I did.

21144. What did he say?—He made no remark.

21145. He is not one of the inspectors of whom you complain?—I don't complain of these reports, because Mr. McEnery, generally speaking, was a fair man and competent, and generally the teachers were satisfied with him, and, of course, as a representative teacher, I was not going to bring forward my own grievances.

21146. Mr. COPPEY.—What was his mark in 1907?—"Very good."

21147. The CHAIRMAN.—You fell under the same inspector in 1905?—Yes.

21148. What was your mark in 1909?—"Very good."

21149. In 1910?—It was lowered in 1910 by Mr. Welgely to "good."

21150. He came in 1909?—On the 1st July, 1909.

21151. Was that your first inspection by him?—He paid an incidental visit on 26th October, 1909.

21152. On the 25th November, 1910, he gave you an examination for a general report?—Yes; with the mark "good."

21153. Describe the character of the incidental visit?—There were some matters that occurred before—

21154. What is your recollection of the first visit?—I came to the school at 12 minutes past 9 o'clock. I went into the school and found Mr. Welgely at the school table, and the school records before him. Later on I had a statement, which I will hand in, from the boy who procured the key in a neighbouring house. As the boy states, I was usually there at 9 o'clock, but this morning I was delayed owing to a bicycle puncture. He said the inspector came about 9 o'clock; that he made some inquiries about the teacher; that he inquired for the key, and sent a boy to procure it, and got him to open the school, and that the inspector and some pupils then went into the school. Mr. Welgely went first to my desk, raised the lid, and looked at some documents there. He then went to the teacher's table and opened the drawer, and put the school account books before him, and he was at these books when I arrived.

He saluted you when you came in?—He nodded, but remained sitting.

21155. Mr. COPPEY.—You were not bound to be there at that hour?—No. 9.30.

* Vide Appendix LXXII.

2nd September, 1913.]

Mr. E. MANSFIELD examined.

[Continued.]

21150. The CHAIRMAN.—That was in 1910. I want to know a little more about the incidental visit. Did he write anything in the observation book?—Yes, he said the work of the school is good, or words to that effect.

21151. The impression you have is that he was satisfied with the school?—Yes.

21152. And found nothing wrong with the records?—Well you let me tell you about the records? He makes particular reference to the register. Now, the register in the old days was of a different type altogether from the new register. There were a number of matters and columns that had to be filled in formerly that need not be touched now. It is not necessary at present to fill in a lot of matter that had to be filled in in the old days, and a good many teachers since 1900, when the new system came in, neglected the register, and did not regard it as an important document. I know the inspectors generally did not attach much importance to it, seeing that the particulars in the register were in other books. I believe one book would do for the lot; there are no other particulars that would be required that are not in the roll book.

21153. The register is not essential in the working of the present system?—No; I think it is a piece of red-tape. One book would do instead of the four.

21154. Teachers have been neglecting it, and regard it as antiquated?—Yes, and inspectors also.

21155. Mr. KERR.—What is it meant to be? A list of pupils?—There were the same lists given which are also in the other books.

21156. The CHAIRMAN.—Under the results system the register, I understand, was important because it contained statistics?—Yes, the past marks of the previous pupils.

21157. It is quite different now?—There is one point regarding the register I should like to mention. Mr. Welby said I had neglected it altogether during a number of years. That is not so. Particulars regarding the pupils and the like were written up to date in my register. There were other particulars given in the other books that I did not think necessary to enter.

21158. Mr. HENRY.—That is the number of attendances and classes examined?—Yes.

21159. The CHAIRMAN.—Did he examine on the occasion of his incidental visit?—No.

21160. Did he go over the written work?—Yes, and he heard some teaching.

21161. The CHAIRMAN.—I ought to have asked you have you an assistant?—I should say my predecessor had the register unwritten for two years before my appointment.

21162. I do not think we need go into the question of the register. Try and follow the order I am trying to strike out. Complete your observations on the incidental visit. The observations on your school were on the whole satisfactory?—Yes; on the whole they were satisfactory.

21163. Mr. HENRY.—Did he write anything in the observation book?—Yes; that the work of the school was on the whole satisfactory.

21164. The CHAIRMAN.—You had an assistant teacher?—Yes, a junior assistant mistress, and my report was lowered at the next visit because of her work.

21165. With regard to his examination next month, what mark did he give in the general report?—The general examination in the next month, the only examination he held in my school was on the 28th November, 1910.

21166. That was what I meant; for the general report?—Yes.

21167. How long did he stay?—About three hours in the school; he examined both schools.

21168. Did he examine very minutely?—Yes, and went outside the whole year's course.

21169. Somebody said he examined in the style of the old results' system?—That is so. I'll give you some particulars.

21170. What mark did he give at the end?—“Good.”

21171. What mark did you get from the office afterwards?—“Good.” He spoke of the work of the junior assistant mistress; he was anxious, apparently, to get rid of her, and asked me would I not speak to the manager. I told him I would do no such thing; that

this junior assistant mistress had done satisfactory work under my predecessor and had helped me to some extent to raise the average, and I would be no party to it. He states he told me he would give the mark “good,” but what he said was—“I cannot tell until I look up my notes and see the written work.” I felt the whole examination of the school was unfair. I wrote a statement and brought it to the manager.

21172. Was that before you were informed of the mark?—Yes, before I was informed.

21173. What ground was there for that?—He went outside the whole year's programme with some of the class.

21174. I should have thought you might have valued until you had seen the mark?—Well, considering his examination of the pupils, and considering the circumstances under which it was held, and his remarks regarding the junior assistant mistress, and fearing the results would be serious for her, I made out a statement and went to Canon O'Neill, and told him exactly what occurred, and requested him to make an appeal to the Board.

21175. What was the need for the appeal?—For a re-examination.

21176. Before you heard the mark?—Yes; I expected he would lower the report.

21177. You appealed on that?—No, I did not appeal, I went to the manager.

21178. He did not appeal?—No; he said—“Will you lose your increment through the lowering of the report; you are sure of ‘good’?” I said “No; but he wishes to get rid of the junior assistant mistress, and I should like to have the school treated fairly.” “Well,” he said, “if you appeal nothing good will come of it. Mr. Welby will be more severe next time, and what I advise you to do is to leave out those remarks regarding Mr. Welby. State the adverse circumstances, and write a statement to Mr. Welby for his consideration.”

21179. That was his advice?—Yes, and in my letter to Mr. Welby—

21180. There is a statement—“I find the junior assistant mistress had no preparation for work. Some time ago she refused to attend an organizer's class, and I pointed all this out to Mr. Mansfield.”—I can tell you that Miss Cleary did usually make notes for her work; on that particular day she had no notes. She did not refuse to attend an organizer's class, and I did hand in a statement* to that effect. She was invited to attend an organizer's class, but her brother was getting married the same week; there was no other member of the family at home. She was very anxious to improve herself, and spent in attending two seasons at the Ballingary Irish College £12, out of a salary of £28.

21181. Mr. COSTER.—Would not attending the organizer's class at Cahir be an expensive thing for a junior assistant?—The expense of attending would be paid; it was not unwillingness to attend, but the fact that her brother was getting married.

21182. Mr. KERR.—Was the class to last one week?—No; four weeks, but, of course, if she was not there from the beginning it would not be much good, and besides, she would scarcely be admitted. There is the further statement he makes, that she subsequently attended an organizer's class. That is untrue. After Mr. Welby's visit she never attended an organizer's class. That is put in apparently to justify himself regarding the report next year when Mr. Fitzgerald came.

21183. The CHAIRMAN.—What was the report next year 1911?—“Good.” The inspector examined at the end of October. He says—“The principal is highly capable and efficient; the junior assistant is only moderately so.” The mark that came from the office was “good.” I consider Mr. Fitzgerald, on the whole, a fair examiner, but he struck me as if he had to follow Mr. Welby in his marking.

21184. Mr. Hynes came then?—Yes; the second week in November.

21185. And gave you “very good”?—I did not know until I saw it in the evidence.

21186. I have it here?—I got no official communication. The District Inspector's mark still stands.

* Vide Appendix LXIII.

21193. I have it here, "very good," given by the chief inspector?—Yes; Mr. Hynes's visit was made before I received from the office the report of Mr. Fitzgerald. Mr. Fitzgerald's report stood, and there was no change in the mark.

21194. Your school stood at "good"?—Yes.

21195. And you learned the interesting fact later from the chief inspector that it was "very good"?—I never learned it till I saw it in the evidence. Mr. Fitzgerald is a fair examiner, but his examination was much more searching, and the children did much better than with Mr. Hynes. When Mr. Hynes came the day was wet; it was also fair day, and most of my best boys were away; but I consider that both should have given "very good."

Mr. CORRY.—Mr. Hynes did give the school "very good."

21196. The CHAIRMAN.—That was subsequently. The point is, he did not know about the "very good" until the Blue Book was published. Now, we were engaged upon the subject of the general examination by Mr. Welply in 1910. He gave "good," that year?—Yes.

21197. I want to get at this point: what was the character of the observations he left in your observation book that year?—I should not like to trust my memory regarding the exact words, but I will hand in the document later.

21198. I should think you must have an impression as to what the observation was?—Yes.

21199. Mr. HENRY.—What did he write in the observation book?—There were so many observations I cannot remember. He referred to a great many things—the school surroundings, the absence of shrubs, and things of that kind. I had spent £81 out of my own salary in nine years upon the school, and he urged further spending.

21200. The CHAIRMAN.—Would you explain—for this is a very important point—for what objects was that spent?—I will tell you. All the facts are in the Education Office. I spent it in connection with the science press, on a number of maps and charts for the teaching of Irish and singing, and for two tables.

21201. Wooden tables?—Yes; one for the teacher's books, and another for Science. On various occasions I improved the walls, coating them with paint, and I got a number of pictures for the walls. Then year after year there was a balance due to me for heating and cleaning.

21202. You say there was a balance due to you for heating and cleaning; would you explain?—Each year I got coal, the pupils contributing a portion of the cost, and I bearing the rest.

21203. But now you have a grant for heating and cleaning?—Yes; during the last two years.

21204. Were you responsible for the clearing of the school after the grant came?—No; I will look in my note-book for the dates. I must say in justice to the manager—

21205. Allow me to follow this up—it is difficult sometimes to keep to the one line—these are the objects for which you spent your own money?—These are some of the objects.

21206. Did you tell the manager who paid for these things?—No; I made no application to the manager.

21207. Did you tell him you were doing so?—Of course it went into the annual returns year after year. These returns went to the manager and the Board, and the returns are in the Education Office.

21208. Are those payments of yours reported to the Board?—Yes, certainly.

21209. Mr. HENRY.—Yes. The payments return is made by you?—I gave the facts each year.

21210. The CHAIRMAN.—It is against the present rules of the Board for you to spend money on the school?—Just now.

21211. Mr. HENRY.—The point, I think, is this: there are returns under the head of local contributions?—Yes, and I stated the amount spent by the manager, the pupils, and the teacher.

21212. The CHAIRMAN.—Let us get this distinctly. In your returns you state certain sums spent by yourself for the upkeep of the school?—Yes.

21213. Can you tell us up to what date you did that?—There was a balance due to me for each year, and for several years up to within the last two years.

21214. Do you know the date of that rule being introduced forbidding the teachers to spend money—

21215. Mr. HENRY.—I think that came subsequently?—I think it is within the last two years that rule came into force. The manager spent a good deal upon the school for new desks, windows and other things.

21216. The CHAIRMAN.—Did he pay for them himself?—Yes; there was no fund.

21217. The inspector finds fault about a number of things on which you had spent money. With regard to his examination, what range did it take?—He went outside the whole year's course.

21218. What do you mean?—He went outside the whole year's course, and the examination was too severe even on that.

21219. How many months was it from the beginning of the school year proper?—It was November 1909; there was six weeks' vacation; it would be roughly three-and-a-half months of school work.

21220. He took the children over the work they could not do in that three-and-a-half months?—Yes.

21221. Was your manager present?—No.

21222. Did he get notice of it?—I have not heard.

21223. He never mentioned that to you?—No. It was Mr. Welply's custom to send notice on the morning of the examination, and in many cases to send word by wire to the manager.

21224. Was the manager present?—No. An examination I remember him present at was a portion of the time with Mr. Fitzgerald, and also on the occasion when Mr. Fitzgerald came to examine Irish.

21225. Mr. Welply had no chance of consulting with the manager on that day?—No; no opportunity. The general impression among the teachers—and I think there is justification for it—is that this is how he manages to reach the manager. He sends notice on the morning of the examination, and in many cases by wire, and, of course, a manager living four miles away could not possibly be there during his examination.

21226. Mr. CORRY.—What do you mean by "managing to reach the manager"?—I got the information confidentially. I heard it on good authority, but I am not at liberty to give the proofs. Don't give it if you don't know.

21227. The CHAIRMAN.—We cannot take these remarks you heard. That was the only examination by Mr. Welply you know about?—He examined in mathematics in June, 1911. There is usually a special examination, and he wrote in the book, "Examination in Mathematics; boys well prepared." Generally speaking, his examination was fair in these subjects.

21228. Were you fairly satisfied with his examination?—Yes, but I considered it fairly severe.

21229. Many of us consider that at times. Have you anything to complain of in his manner and behaviour?—I think him rather cold and unsympathetic, and that was the impression of the junior assistant also.

21230. You have no complaint of positive rudeness?—Not with regard to his action in the school, but I considered him rather rude in the treatment he meted out to me in correspondence previous to this visit. I can give you the facts.

21231. When was his first visit?—On the 26th of October, 1910, and the next on the 28th November, 1910, five weeks afterwards.

21232. You corresponded with him before his first visit to your school?—Yes.

21233. What was the nature of that?—I sent notice to Mr. Welply to Chomel of the closing of the school for the annual vacation. I am positive I sent that notice. I went up to the Limerick Junction with another teacher named Mr. Cronin, to post the letter to the inspector. I told Mr. Cronin, and I remarked that I heard from the Belfast teachers that the new inspector was a stickler for red-tape. The address on the envelope was "Senior Inspector of Schools, Chomel." Mr. Cronin saw that. About a week afterwards Mr. Welply came to the village of Cullin. He met on the way the principal of the girls' school. She had closed her school also, but had sent notice only on the previous evening. He had not got it. She was pointed out to Mr. Welply by some person on the road, and he asked her, "Are you the teacher here." She said "yes." "Have you closed school," said he.

2nd September, 1913.]

Mr. E. MANSFIELD examined.

[Continued.]

"Yes," said she. "Why did you not send me notice," said he; "I am the senior inspector," and then he asked "Would you get me the key of your school?" While she was getting the key—I heard from people who saw him—Mr. Welby went into the yard of the boys' school, looked through the windows, and was taking notes down in his notebook. When the principal of the girls' school came up she opened the school and examined the accounts. He states the junior assistant reference was present. That is not the case, and as this is a matter of fact that can easily be verified, it should be noted. Here is a letter in proof.

21294. With regard to your own letter, what happened?—He wrote to me on a scrap of paper, "Memo, for principal teacher"—this is the substance of it—"The principal teacher of Collier Boys' School will state (1) when school closed; (2) when school will re-open; (3) why no notice was sent in accordance with Practical Rule 14, to the senior inspector. The principal teacher's attention is directed to the fact that the school gate is without a lock. Supply particulars regarding teachers on front page of observation book. Reply on the other side." I thought the note rather discourteous, and replied on the other side much in the same tone, thus: "The principal teacher of Collier Boys' School hereby informs the senior inspector—(1) School closed on such a day (giving the date); (2) school will be re-opened on such a date (giving the date); (3) notice was sent in accordance with Rule 14, sent to Mr. McEnery and to the senior inspector. If the latter address was not sufficiently definite I had merely resorted to change to guide me. The senior inspector's suggestions re lock will receive attention. The following are the particulars asked for, and I gave them. In about a week he wrote on another of those scraps of paper—"Memo, for Mr. Mansfield. Referring to our previous correspondence, Mr. Mansfield is informed that no letter addressed as he states reached me; though several letters from other teachers, addressed in precisely the same terms, have reached me.—W. H. Welby."

21295. I want to ask one question on this. What is the form inspectors usually adopt in writing to teachers on these subjects?—Some address the teacher "Sir." Some "Dear Sir." In some cases it is an official memorandum—written on one side, room upon the other side for answer.

21296. Your point as to the mode of address was unnecessary?—Generally the whole tone of the letter was unsatisfactory.

21297. Do you object to his addressing a memorandum of that kind to you without putting it in a more formal way?—There was no "please," or "I am sorry," such as other inspectors would use. There was an obvious want of courtesy.

21298. Mr. COOPER.—Is not your difficulty this—that he questioned your word about having sent notice?—Of course, there is the plain implication that I did not send it.

21299. The CHAIRMAN.—What did you say to that?—I said, "In order to facilitate you in any further inquiry you may care to make regarding the letter you state did not reach you, I beg to inform you that the letter in question was with others (for example that to Mr. McEnery), which reached their destination, posted at the Limerick Junction." Then the Board sent down a direction asking me to keep Rule 14, which I had kept.

21300. To observe Rule 14?—Yes; of course, I have been documentary proof I had kept the rule, and in any case if he did not get the letter I should have thought he might take my word that it was sent.

21301. That is all you have to say about the correspondence?—Seeing I was accused for an alleged breach of a rule I had kept I registered my letters in future to Mr. Welby for about a year. At the end of that time he referred to the fact that he had some trouble in getting my correspondence and directed me to communicate by ordinary post in future. I did so for the future. I posted my letters by train and, of course, got receipts though they went by the ordinary post. Of course, I would not have dreamt of asking in that fashion if I had been treated casually.

21302. All this took place before his inspection in 1910?—About fourteen months before.

21303. Was that alluded to when he visited you at first?—There was not a word about it.

21304. You did not say anything, and he did not?—Oh, no; I treated him courteously then, as I did at every visit.

21305. I think you told us that Mr. McEnery got that notice which you sent. Did he tell you that he received that notice?—I am almost certain he did, I don't know absolutely. Of course, I would not have dreamt of corresponding with Mr. McEnery on the subject.

21306. The point is, Mr. McEnery would inform you if he did not get the notice?—That is so.

21307. Was that the last of Mr. Welby's inspections that you have to speak of?—The actual examination of the pupils was on the 29th November, and I should like to say a few words upon that.

21308. The general charge is that he examined in the old style before 1900?—As a matter of fact I have no objection to examination properly held.

21309. But is not that the charge, that he examined really in the old results style?—Not in accordance with the spirit of Dr. Sturges's speeches and circulars. I have no objection to examination under proper conditions.

21310. Will you tell us his style. He was three or four hours there, was he not?—About three hours.

21311. Well that does not matter?—He spent about six hours or six hours and a half between the two schools.

21312. What I want to know is the mode of the examination?—Some of the children were laid up with mumps at that time, some had just come back to school, some were away. In the junior division there was one class, and the average attendance of the boys in it for that year was about 174. We can get the facts from Miss Clenry's statement. On that particular day there were five absent out of eight. Of the three present there was one stupid boy, and there was another fairly bright boy who had been absent for three weeks. His main examination for the junior division was of those three boys of the second class. He gave a hurried examination of the infants, and he examined—and I do not think it is in accordance with official directions—the infants by pointing out words to them in the books. There was a good first class present, but he never put a question to the first class at all.

21313. He did not ask a single question of your boys of the first class?—No. He examined in dictation, and the third class had not begun dictation at this time. He insisted on their writing dictation with the fourth. I read the passages, and he was constantly saying, "Have they not finished?"

21314. You were made to read passages that the boys of the third class could not be expected to write, and were not able to grasp the meaning of the words?—Well, they could grasp the meaning of the words, but not being accustomed to write from dictation, it was not a fair test; they were rushed, the fourth class should have got once and a half more time than that actually given to the third.

21315. Mr. HENLY.—Were you not reading yourself?—Yes.

21316. The CHAIRMAN.—But if Mr. Welby was continually hurrying the children, that would mean, of course, that you had to go fast?—Yes. Then he got me to draw a pattern on the blackboard and the third and fourth and fifth standards had to copy this pattern in about half the time that it would take sixth class boys to do it. There was an examination of the fourth class in reading. He asked what my fourth boys had been reading. Besides the ordinary Reader, the senior boys had been reading Addison's Essays. Two good boys in fourth read with them. I made it a point in all classes to try and urge good boys on. He put Addison's Essays into the hands of the whole fourth class to examine them on it. The essay was "Sir Roger at the Play." He questioned them closely on the subject-matter, and he examined not merely the two boys mentioned, but the whole fourth class on the subject-matter of lessons they had never seen before. In examining the third and fourth in geography he put them along a line as in the results days. He took the boys of the third and fourth, and here are some of

the questions he put to boys of the third class. He took the map of Ireland, with which the boys of the third class were not conversant yet. He turned the boys with their backs to the map, and he asked such questions as—"What county is north of Down? What inlet of the sea lies between? What river flows into the inlet? Tell me all you know about the industries of Belfast? Can you account for the commercial prosperity of Belfast? What river flows into Lough Neagh? What river flows out? Tell me about the fisheries of the Bann?"

21257. He did not ask them. "What do you regard as the possible future of Belfast?"—No. He turned a boy round and asked him to point to Meath and Wicklow, and from the appearance of these counties what difference did he expect in the occupation of the people of the counties? I consider that to be a curious question to put to any little fellow of eight and half years or less.

21258. What was the age of the children?—About seven and a half.

21259. They would be third class children?—Yes; only a few months in third class.

21260. Mr. HENLY.—Your point is that he went outside the programme for the third class?—Yes.

21261. The CHAIRMAN.—Did he look at the Progress record?—No, he did not.

21262. Do other Inspectors usually do that?—Yes, as a matter of fact I kept a Progress record up to the time of Mr. Welply's visit. He went outside its scope, he never enquired for it, and the next day, considering the whole proceeding a farce, I threw the Progress record into the fire.

21263. You never kept any after?—No.

21264. And were never asked for it?—No.

21265. I heard here before of preparation for the day's work. Did any Inspector ever ask you about your preparation?—Yes, Mr. Welply asked for preparation for week, and I had none. But I consider that under Mr. Browne better preparation was made, at least by me and several others. In preparing work for Mr. Welply it was more or less with the object of showing it to the Inspector.

21266. You didn't do it much before?—I did preparation of a more effective kind. I was usually in school at nine in the morning, and prepared the work on the blackboards, etc.

21267. You had not a notebook to show to the Inspector?—I had a notebook, but it was of a different nature altogether. I prepared notes of what I considered rather difficult lessons in grammar, arithmetic, geography, and science, but when Mr. Welply came I prepared notes that were absolutely no use.

21268. Was he satisfied with the notes?—He was satisfied.

21269. He was not satisfied with the assistant's notes?—The assistant hadn't notes that day, but I have she had prepared her work.

21270. It is your business to see that the assistant does make preparation?—I have no control over the assistant.

21271. I thought you had?—No. When she was appointed I gave her all possible help.

21272. Has the principal no power over the junior assistant?—No.

Mr. HARRISON.—I did not know that.

21273. The CHAIRMAN.—I am glad this has been brought out?—No power, except I went to the junior assistant and suggested it would be well she should do so and so, but I would not dream of giving her an order.

Does not that conflict with another principle of the Board, that the assistant mistress may have, and often has, a different personal mark from the teacher. If the teacher's personal mark is "V.G." is it not because of an inferior assistant his school does not get that mark, because it is said that the teacher is responsible for the whole conduct of the school?—

Mr. HENLY.—That is so.

21274. The CHAIRMAN.—Do you see my point?—I had nothing to do with the appointment of the junior assistant, and had no control over her.

21275. Mr. KITTLE.—Don't you arrange her timetable?—We do that under the direction of the Inspector. That is submitted to the Inspector and has to be sanctioned by him.

Mr. HENLY.—What Mr. Mansfield means is this: If the assistant chooses to disobey his directions, he had no power to compel her to obey.

21276. The CHAIRMAN.—I understood him to go further, and say he did not consider it part of his duty to control the assistant?—I consider I had no power to give directions. I might suggest in a friendly way that it would be well to do so and so, for the good of the school, and of the assistant.

21277. Inasmuch as the assistant may damage the emoluments of the principal by damaging the school, I should say it is his interest to control the assistant?—Yes, he has an assistant but no power of control.

21278. Mr. HARRISON.—This is rather a new point to me. May I put a question. Supposing you give definite instructions as to method to your assistant, and she refused to carry that out, have you no remedy?—What authority have I to give definite instructions to the assistant?

21279. As principal of the school?—I don't consider I have power to do so. I know one principal who had a junior assistant, a rather inefficient junior assistant, and she was injuring the school. The principal interfered, and the junior assistant sent a complaint on to the Board.

21280. On her own initiative or through the manager, which?—Through the manager. An investigation was held, with the result that the principal was dismissed for undue interference. That teacher was Miss Mary Donnelly.

The CHAIRMAN.—That is quite new to me.

21281. Mr. HARRISON.—Can you give us chapter and verse?—

The CHAIRMAN.—It comes in in Mr. MacSweeney's evidence, I think?—Miss Donnelly had this junior assistant, who was appointed by one of the inspectors. The principal found her writing misspelt words upon the blackboard, and she suggested it would be well she should do so and so. The junior assistant looked up a row, and it ended in the dismissal of both teachers.

21282. Mr. HARRISON.—Will there be any further statement about that?—

The CHAIRMAN.—Yes, we will ask Mr. MacSweeney about it?—Miss Donnelly is prepared to come here and support it.

21283. Mr. HARRISON.—I am to conclude that as principal you consider you had no authority to give instructions as to methods of teaching to one of your assistants?—I had no authority to do it.

21284. The CHAIRMAN.—I want to get this perfectly clear, because it is a surprise to me. I didn't know it before. Your theory is, and that of your colleagues, that a principal has no power to control the teaching of an assistant?—Yes, that is my opinion.

21285. If you had an assistant teaching badly you have no right to say, "That is bad teaching"?—I have no authority to interfere, and I have shown the result of interfering.

21286. Is that the theory generally of your brother teachers?—Yes, that is the general opinion.

21287. Mr. HARRISON.—As a matter of fact it comes to this. Your authority depends upon whether you can depend upon the support of your manager?—No, I should not say so. It depends upon the view the Board takes of my action. I have been dismissed without any consultation with my manager. We may be dismissed by the manager or by the Board.

The CHAIRMAN.—As a matter of fact, the phrase of the Board is that it ceases to recognize the teacher? Mr. HENLY.—That he is dismissed from their service?—It means the same.

Witness.—As regards the lowering of the mark, we are told that mark of the school usually corresponds with the mark of the principal teacher. A J.A.M. can, however, pull it down.

21288. The CHAIRMAN.—Does that seem that it generally corresponds?—Mr. O'Connor contends that it would take three or four assistants with poor marks to lower the mark of the principal teacher.

2nd September, 1913.]

Mr. E. MANSFIELD examined.

[Continued.]

21288. I don't remember that. I don't think that that was ever stated—I'll raise that point again. The statement has been made that the mark generally corresponds with the mark of the principal teacher.

21289. I repeat what I said in connection with what you have told us. It surprises me very much that the poorer mark of the assistant may drag down the mark of the school!—You have it there in Mr. Welby's own statement (see Appendix, First Volume of Evidence) that while my work was very good, the work of the junior assistant was not good, and the mark of the school was lowered. The next school to mine, that of Mr. Lusk, a mile away, had its mark lowered on two occasions because of the less satisfactory work of the junior assistant.

Mr. HENRY.—It is admitted over and over again. Witness.—There is another school in the same parish where it was lowered for the same reason.

21291. The CHAIRMAN.—All I can say is that I cannot reconcile that with your statement that you have no control over the assistant.

Mr. COFFEY.—It is unquestionable that he has no control over the teacher.

The CHAIRMAN.—It is very startling. My point is that there is an immense contrast between the two things. If the assistant can drag down the school mark, and so affect the emoluments of head teachers, is it not startling that the head teachers may not control the teaching of the assistants?—

Mr. KESTLE.—It is more than startling.

Mr. HENRY.—You may make representations to the manager or to the Board, if the manager will allow you, or you may write to the inspector.

Witness.—In justice to the junior assistant, I must say she was doing her work very well.

21292. The CHAIRMAN.—We are not doubting that fact—I think there was a reason for lowering the work of the junior assistant.

21293. Mr. COFFEY.—The point is whether the principal teacher has any right to control?—In fairness to the junior assistant, I should say that her work was as satisfactory as in previous years. The average of the school was raised above 50, and I believe her appointment had something to do with it as well as my work. Immediately that the average went above 50, she became, in the official records, inefficient, in order to run her out and to have an assistant appointed. The object of the lowering at this particular time was, to my mind, especially on account of what Mr. Welby said to me, to get rid of the junior assistant under the new rule that had been framed, which ignored the rights of those teachers under the 50 average rule. When the average came up to 50 the junior assistant was to be removed and a fully qualified assistant appointed. At this time the average in my school was over 50, and they wished apparently to get rid of the junior assistant, and accordingly her work, previously reported on as satisfactory, became unsatisfactory. I consider they did not treat her fairly.

21294. The CHAIRMAN.—Was her work praised before that?—Yes, by two other inspectors.

21295. Have you particulars in the observation book?—Her work is referred to as satisfactory.

21296. The CHAIRMAN.—If you have done with that, we will go on now to something else. We have your various merit marks up to the examination by Mr. Welby in June, 1911, and just to complete the thing, will you turn to our Report, p. 211, relating to your school. We have gone over a good many of the topics in that statement. Is there anything you wish to add in regard to that statement?—There is.

21297. What part of the statement?—The first paragraph. He says I wrote him a letter in which I said, "You have the reputation of being just if severe."

21298. That was the letter of the 30th November?—The examination was held on the 28th. I went to the manager on the following evening making a complaint of the unfair conditions under which the school was examined by Mr. Welby. Acting on the advice of the manager, who requested me to write to Mr. Welby, I altered the first paragraph of my letter in

this way—I asked for a copy of it and did not get it, but it began in this way:—"I have never sought for favours from the Education Office or from any official, and I am not going to begin now, but there are certain circumstances connected with your examination of the school on the 28th that I should like to bring under your notice. You have the reputation of being just if severe." That was on the 30th November. I heard from the Belfast teachers he was a severe examiner, and the fact that I said so would indicate the general opinion of Mr. Welby among the teachers. As to his being just; I had no direct evidence at that particular time that he was not just.

21299. Mr. KESTLE.—Was not that a casual flourish?—Not exactly; a consolatory one.

21300. The CHAIRMAN.—You mean the feeling had not come to a head?—No, there was a rumour here and there, and my object was not to offend him, but to put it as modestly as possible for the sake of the junior assistant, as the matter was put to me by the manager. Personally, I was safe; my mark was "very good."

21301. The purpose of the letter was to secure a higher mark?—To point out the conditions under which the examination of the school had been conducted. There was an epidemic of scumps which lowered the attendance, and there were other matters, and he should take the adverse circumstances into account in the marking of the school. To this I drew his attention.

21302. You concluded he had formed an unfavourable impression?—I was in doubt as to what mark he would give from what he said. I am absolutely sure of this. He said, "You have done very good work," but about the junior assistant—I cannot tell exactly the words—but the purport of it was to justify a rather unfavourable report of the school, owing to the junior assistant. I asked, "What mark are you going to give the school?" and he said, "I cannot tell until I consult my notes what mark I will give; your own work is very good."

21303. Is there anything more in that statement that you wish to remark upon?—About a month later we had a meeting in Thurles and a number of teachers complained to me of the marking, and I thought then, as a representative teacher, though I never would have complained publicly because of my own case, that I would not be doing my duty if I did not raise the question there and then.

21304. Was the meeting at Thurles for the purpose of considering Mr. Welby's report?—No, it was on primary education generally.

21305. Was it a conference?—Yes.

21306. And it was at that meeting in Thurles that for the first time in public you heard teachers attacking his mode of inspection?—A number of teachers spoke of his lowering their reports, some complained of his manner, some of his methods, some of the fact that he was trying to punish the pupils in their schools, and they complained of general unfairness.

21307. Am I right in concluding that that was the first time you based of general discontent?—Yes, complaints of general discontent.

21308. Mr. COFFEY.—You heard of discontent before?—Yes.

21309. The CHAIRMAN.—You were not aware of its general character?—No, I did not get my own report back until about five weeks after that meeting, which was on the 16th January.

21310. You were beginning to tell us the reason of your taking action. What did you do after that?—The Committee of the County Association decided to have a further meeting some time in January. Then we sent out a number of forms to principals of schools asking for their marks for a number of years. A large number of teachers returned forms, and we saw that there was a general lowering of the reports.

21311. That was the first step you took?—That was the first. But complaints had been made previously regarding Mr. Cole.

21312. That was in January, 1911?—Yes; at the beginning of 1911.

21313. What followed that?—Then it was decided to prepare a Memorial for the Board. We saw that the marks of a large number of teachers had been lowered—some were lowered by two steps, some had

appealed to the Board, and even in cases where the reports were lowered two steps, the Board refused an appeal.

21314. Did you hear of any cases where appeals were granted?—Not in any case. The general opinion was that appeals would rather injure the teachers than otherwise. In fact, the expression used by the manager of my own school was that probably it would make Mr. Welby more severe. We had a memorial sent to the Board, asking the Board to receive a deputation. The Board did not receive the deputation. Another point I wish to bring out is the long time that elapsed between the examination and the sending of the report from the office. It was said that some of our complaints were very old. I made an average of the length of the periods that passed between the actual examination and the receipt of the reports, and roughly the official delay was on the average 90 days.

21315. From the date of the examination until the report reached the teacher?—Yes. In my own case I found it averaged about 50 days for nine years.

21316. That is for the Minutes to reach you?—Yes. There is the case of the ——— School where the examination was held in the middle of June, 1910, and the report reached the teacher only in the May following, and the next examination was held on the 17th May, and in this case the report had been lowered to "mildling." I wish to make it clear that our delay regarding the memorial was really but five months on the average for the schools concerned. It took a considerable time to collect statistics and prepare our memorial, and the big delay was made by the office. The office had all the facts at its disposal from the 26th June, the date on which they received our memorial, until the middle of the following November, when Mr. Hynes visited the district. That was five months, not two years, as has been said. Of course, we were placed at considerable disadvantage. We asked at various times for Returns through Parliament, and we were always refused on the ground of the interest of the public service. We saw that Mr. Cole was lowering reports all round. There was a resolution passed by the Tipperary Association on the 8th February, 1910, asking for an investigation into Mr. Cole's marking that year. It was acknowledged by Mr. Dilworth, one of the Secretaries, but no action was taken by the Board. A similar resolution was sent from the West Clare Teachers to the Central Executive in the autumn of 1910, and this also was ignored. That was also in reference to Mr. Cole's marking, but the Board took no action.

21317. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—You say they ignored the resolution of the Executive, was that communicated?—I think it was communicated to Mr. Dilworth.

21318. Unless it was communicated you cannot complain of their ignoring it?—I am perfectly certain the Tipperary resolution was sent to the Board, and acknowledged by Mr. Dilworth.

21319. Mr. COFFEY.—Have you any knowledge as to whether the resolution of the Clare teachers in regard to Mr. Cole was noticed in any way. Were the Clare teachers accused for some resolution?—I have not heard of that, but I know that as regards Mr. Cole's marking in our district, before our memorial went to the Board, the people in the Education Office had knowledge of the general lowering of marks and of the dissatisfaction with regard to this general lowering by Mr. Cole, a newly appointed junior inspector.

21320. The CHAIRMAN.—You say the office must have known of the general lowering of the marks in Tipperary and that district?—Yes, from the resolutions forwarded by our Association.

21321. From what time?—From February, 1910.

21322. From February, 1910, it must have been known to the office or to the principal inspector?—Yes.

21323. Who is responsible for the maintenance of uniform marking?—I don't believe there is uniform marking.

21324. Well, a considerable uniformity, who do you say is responsible?—So far as I can see everybody in the office is shirking responsibility.

21325. Is there one official more responsible than

another?—I should say the responsibility rests with the Resident Commissioner.

21326. But, among those who examined the schools, upon whom would you settle the responsibility wholly?—It depends not on those who examine schools.

21327. Have you any idea of whom you would make responsible?—Of course, in the old days the chief inspectors and the heads were responsible.

21328. Are the chief inspectors now responsible?—Judging from the volumes of evidence, they don't seem to have any authority to do anything.

21329. There is nobody in the office whose business it is to call attention to the uniform lowering of marks?—I don't think so. I think it would be much better if there was some person with practical experience of the schools, like chiefs of inspection, who should be responsible. I don't believe in the examination no matter how highly qualified.

21330. Dr. Starke's visit was in connection with this discontent?—Yes.

21331. Did he visit your school?—Yes; very early in October, the 4th October, 1911.

21332. Will you describe that visit?—Mr. Dilworth came and told me that the Resident Commissioner was outside inspecting the building.

21333. What made the Resident Commissioner remain outside?—Mrs. Starke came into the school and sat down. The Resident Commissioner shortly afterwards came in and sat at a table and looked over the books. He took out a notebook, and asked me what complaints I had to make regarding Mr. Welby.

21334. What answer did you give?—I said, in general, the complaint I had to make was that he was unfair in examining the school, and discourteous in his correspondence.

21335. You said you did not complain of discourtesy in the school?—Yes; he acted with cold civility to the school.

21336. It was as regards the correspondence of 1909?—Yes. Dr. Starke heard the senior class read, and he made some remarks about the reading, that they read well, but had a slight brogue. I remarked they brought that in the morning but got rid of it during the day, and it came with them next day. Dr. Starke asked some questions in arithmetic. He stayed about half an hour or less—I should say twenty-five minutes.

21337. Did he say anything when leaving?—He said that "the school inside makes a favourable impression, but what about the yard?" Now, I must say the yard was not as I would wish to have it. There were a number of things I would improve if I had the power and the money.

21338. He did not say it in any irritating way?—He said, "What about the yard?" "Well," said I, "I have done a good deal to the school inside, and I'll do something outside when I get the opportunity. In any case," said I, "I am not responsible for the Masting of rocks and the planting of trees. I have done all I could do. It is not fair for your officials to blame me for not doing work for which the Board do not consider I am responsible," because in a communication I had previously from Mr. Ward—it was a semi-official communication—he told me Mr. Welby was complaining I was not doing anything to decorate the place or patting in any flowers or shrubs. When that was written to the office I had flowers of various kinds in the windows for 8 years. The yard was not planted with shrubs, but I expected the Commissioners would give time. In any case my own inclination would lead that way. I brought the fact under Dr. Starke's notice that the inspectors should not blame me for not doing work I was not responsible for doing. The planting of shrubs involves expenditure of money.

21339. Did he go away without saying anything more?—He did; he did not state his opinion of the school.

21340. I think you said he remarked the inside was satisfactory?—He said "the building inside is satisfactory. What about the yard?"

21341. He did not make any remark about the pupils?—Except to say, "These boys read fine and loud, but there is a touch of the brogue in a few cases," Mr. Dilworth remarked—"These boys are very good." Dr. Starke looked over some compositions, and he expressed satisfaction.

21348. When did Mr. Hynes come?—About the middle of November, 1911—the following month.

21349. Will you tell us about his inspection? Did you know the purpose of Mr. Hynes's coming?—I was not told the purpose, but I had an idea he came in connection with the memorial. He came in at half-past two o'clock, and remarked the day was wet. "We have not the usual attendance here to-day; there is a fair in the next town," said I. "Oh, yes," said he, "I know that." He examined the boys in reading, singing, mental arithmetic, parsing and analysis, and he got me to examine them in geography. Generally speaking, I considered his examination a fair one.

21344. Was it a thorough examination?—I would not call it thorough; it was sufficient to test the children.

21345. He would know what the mass of the children knew?—He would have a general idea.

21346. How long did he spend?—About an hour—at least an hour.

21347. Did you know what impression he formed when he left?—No, he did not tell me.

21348. He gave you no indication?—No; and I never heard from the office what mark he gave the school. It was only when the *Bine Beek* was published I knew the mark was "very good."

21349. What followed Mr. Hynes's visit?—Then, of course, we got a statement from the Board. I think it is given in this volume of evidence that they had no reason to think the inspector had not acted fairly.

21350. That he had no reason to think Mr. Welply's marks were excessively severe?—Yes.

21351. What followed?—We had a meeting. Mr. MacNeill was promoted Chief Inspector. We put the matter as earnestly to the Board as possible that an opportunity was offered for removing Mr. Welply to another circuit. We did not put it in these terms. It will be found in Mr. Keegan's letter, page 216, of the volume of evidence. That was simply acknowledged.

21352. They hoped "the Board would seize the opportunity of transferring Mr. Welply to the vacancy left by the promotion of Mr. MacNeill"?—Yes; we believed it was not good for Mr. Welply or for education or for the teachers that he should remain. We believed that while the friction was there—and it was bound to continue, and will continue while he is in Tipperary—that education would not progress as it ought. Of course, we did not attempt to dictate to the Board; we merely suggested this change.

21353. Mr. Kavanagh.—Don't you think the friction would follow him to another circuit?—The probability is that Mr. Welply did not like the friction that had materialised any more than we did, but he had got a lesson, and could profit by it.

21354. Mr. Huxley.—He would have an opportunity of mending his ways?—Yes.

21355. The CHAIRMAN.—You were hopeless of him in your own circuit?—Yes, we knew that he would not improve. There would be a feeling rankling that we could not expect justice from Mr. Welply. I am sure the friction is bound to continue while he remains.

21356. Was any allegation made?—You say you cannot expect justice. Some say he is just, but the men before him were too lenient?—I do not believe the men before him were lenient. They were just.

21357. You heard it said?—Yes; but I firmly believe it is not the case. Read the letter from Father Pembroke; Mr. Keegan handed it in.

21358. Mr. HANMER.—Is there any imputation upon Mr. Welply's justice, or is it only on his severity?—I would not like to make a personal attack upon Mr. Welply. Mr. Welply must have been aware of the various addresses of Dr. Starkie in Belfast and elsewhere. We believe he did not act in accordance with the spirit of the circulars of the new system and Dr. Starkie's speeches, and that Mr. Brown and Mr. McHenry did.

21359. There is no imputation on his sense of justice in this way that he favoured some and was hard upon others, or that he did not do even justice to all whether his standard was severe or not?—He was severe all round. Of course, it is hard to reconcile

his methods with the speeches of Dr. Starkie in Belfast, and elsewhere, and we know Dr. Starkie and his officials had a very high opinion of Mr. Welply. They said that he was very efficient. I have heard he was brought to other circuits over other men even after the friction in Tipperary.

21360. And the contention is that he dealt out equal justice, whether severe or not, to everybody?—Well, equal justice, or if you will, equal severity.

21361. The CHAIRMAN.—You were developing your opinion about the supposed excessive leniency of previous inspectors?—Father Pembroke wrote a letter on that. We believe the Commissioners acted unfairly in not putting it in as part of our correspondence. It was sent in as part of our correspondence and it was suppressed, also in the letter to Mr. Birrell.

21362. Will you give us the purport of it?—He spoke of Rockwell College.

21363. He is one of the professors?—He is president, and he said there were hundreds of students in his college, and that the students from Circuit 18 were at least equal to those from any other circuit. We know, too, that in the various scholarships given under the Agricultural Board that they were also equal to the pupils of any other circuit. Under the Tipperary Technical Instruction Committee there were a number of scholarships given at that time, and every year the unsuccessful candidates were more than sufficient to fill the places. In other counties they were not filled, whereas in one small division of Tipperary you had a larger number of scholarships. Then again I sent a boy to Roscrea the very year my mark was lowered and he got first place in the Technical Scholarship Examination, as with several other schools. I do not like bringing these personal matters in, but they will illustrate my point. At the Limerick Gaelic Prais each year there is a shield given for the best school, an harrow, Irish, and singing—all round marks—and the examination is both oral and written. Various counties compete for this shield, and it has come to our circuit almost every year.

21364. You teach Irish yourself?—Yes, and Miss Cleary teaches it.

21365. You speak Irish?—I have a fair conversational knowledge, and can write it.

21366. Your point is that this shield was obtained by your schools?—Yes, in our circuit for four years. I had it for two years.

21367. Is that regarded as a highly testing examination?—Well, it shows that these subjects—history, Irish, and singing—were at least as well taught in Circuit 18 as in any of the neighbouring circuits.

21368. Mr. HANMER.—Mr. Owens told us his pupils in the last year won scholarships to the amount of £100?—The boy I mentioned went up to Roscrea also, and got his scholarship, competing with the scholars of other circuits. In my opinion the teachers of Tipperary are at least equal to those of any other circuit. They are honest workers, and some of the men that made the most serious complaints about the marking of their schools are the very best teachers in the circuit. I am at a disadvantage in not having notes, but there are some other matters I should like to touch on page 206.

21369. The CHAIRMAN.—There is one passage in our Appendix, page 205, in your statement:—"His communications were at first anything but courteous, and one of them—implying I was a liar though I had proof of the truth of what I had stated—positively insulting." Is that as to the matter of your letter?—Yes; it was clear he expressed a doubt that I had posted the letter, and upon his report to the Board I got a reprimand—you could hardly call it a reprimand, it was a sort of censure for not doing what I had proof I had done.

21370. That is what you mean by saying "implying I was a liar"?—Apart from the proof, I think he might have accepted my word.

21371. I think that is what he was referring to?—Yes. Now, on page 78 of the volume of evidence I want to call your attention again to this. I take two schools where the reports of the principals were reduced because of the marks of the justice assistant mistresses. Take question 2012. "The Chairman

2nd September, 1913.]

MR. E. MANSFIELD continued.

[Continued.]

asked Mr. MacNeill: how would it affect the merit mark of a school if the principal had two bad assistants? and the answer is, "that would be difficult to say. The Inspector would have to use his discretion. I would say this, that supposing a principal had two worthless assistants I would be very slow to reduce the merit mark of the school in any way." It is clear Mr. MacNeill would not lower the merit mark on account of the bad work done by one assistant. If you turn to page 106, question 2010, you find Mr. O'Connor asked:—"Have you many cases in which the school and the head teacher were classed differently?—Yes." "If you could explain that it would help us to understand better, because it is a difficult subject, that difference between school and head teacher?" and the answer is, "If you had the principal teacher a very good man, and if you have three or four assistants who are quite different, say 'fair,' the total result of the school will not be 'very good.' You cannot mark that as a very good school." It is clear then that Mr. O'Connor would be slow in reducing the mark of a school even if there were two or three bad assistants in the school. Of course, it is against the practice of the Board as applied to these three schools in our parish as I have mentioned. I wish to clear up that point, because reference was made to it.

21372. Mr. HARRISON.—You come as the representative of a large body of teachers, and I think you might give us their views generally upon certain points which no doubt you have got in your notes. I ask you to take the heads upon which you wish to give us the considered opinion of the teachers upon the present system?—I have some notes I wish to follow generally and suggestions, but they are more or less mixed up under the general heads as I had no time to have them arranged as I should wish.

21373. If you could give them under heads it would make the evidence a little clearer, if not let us have what you are prepared to say, and then questions put to you will help probably to develop all the points?—I have a few notes here regarding my own case, which is typical of teachers called "the teaching teachers" who were trained in the training colleges when the new system was introduced.

21374. These were grievances of the teachers entering the profession about the same time as you did?—Yes. We were given certain premiums regarding salary and promotion under the old rules of the Board. These were completely ignored by the Board when introducing the new system of 1903. I happened to be fully trained in 1903, a year before that system was introduced. I began immediately as a substitute teacher, and it was distinctly understood that service as a substitute teacher would count for a diploma.

21375. You began as a substitute?—Yes. I came out in July, 1899. I was first a substitute for eight months, and I was appointed permanent assistant on the 30th April, 1900. The new rule was put in operation from the 1st April. The teachers in the country did not know about the scheme of salaries until a few months afterwards. I acted as assistant for a year and eight months, and on appointment as principal, although entitled to first class salary, I was placed upon the minimum salary of £56.

21376. The CHAIRMAN.—Sir Hiram Wilkinson suggests where there is a suggested breach of regulation, it would be well to refer to the particular rule?—I had given two years' service after getting special distinction in the training college, and under the old system, I would be entitled to first class salary.

21377. Is that in the rules?—Yes, in the rules up to 1903.

Mr. HENRY.—That is quite right.

Sir HIRAM WILKINSON.—It would be stronger if we had the rule referred to.

21378. Mr. HENRY.—If you have an official statement that you services were regarded as highly efficient for those two years, it is sufficient?—Yes, I have the report.

21379. The CHAIRMAN.—Yes, I know; but they require something more than the report?—Well, the report of the Board was that I had given highly efficient service. My report as a substitute was that I had shown real and efficiency.

21380. Would it not make the case better if you say that in accordance with the rules of 1903 any teacher coming out in the first division of second class, as I presume you did, that that teacher was eligible for promotion to the second of first division in the first class, on giving two years' thoroughly efficient service?—Yes.

21381. As to whether you had given that highly efficient service, the Board might have one view and you might have another?—Yes.

Who gave the certificate?—

21382. Mr. HARRISON.—Did it come from the office?—These certificates never came to the class of teachers I mention. In one case, my report was satisfactory. In another case, it rose from "fair" to "good."

21383. You claim that a teacher classed as the first division of second class, after two years' service highly efficient, ought to be promoted to the second division of first class at the end of two years?—Yes.

21384. Were there any cases in which teachers of exactly your standing were promoted under that rule?—There were men in the training college with me who were promoted.

21385. In the same year?—Yes, in the same year, and whose salary was raised on special consideration by the Commissioners.

21386. There was no breach of privilege in their case?—There was a distinction made, but apparently it was on pressure brought to bear upon the Board.

21387. Their service was considered highly efficient?—Their reports were not as good as my own, they were not so highly qualified, and I had given longer service.

21388. The CHAIRMAN.—That is a very serious thing to say. Do you think those things were obtained by illicit influence? Is that the meaning of what you say?—I mean by the pressure of the managers.

21389. I should say that was illicit?—Yes, so should I. I would not call it corrupt, but in the case of managers who kept up the pressure, the teacher gained. I wrote a pamphlet in 1904 and gave particulars regarding these cases. I hand in the pamphlet.

21390. You know cases in which that pressure was applied?—Yes, I quoted them, giving the names of the teachers and the schools. What occurred was this.

I got special consideration afterwards, after a long correspondence of 21 months. I wanted for one year when they left me at £56. My predecessor's salary was upwards of £120. At the end of a year my salary was on special consideration, raised to £76 a year. They said that they had given me the average salary in such a school of a second class teacher. In about three months another document came back to say that the salary at the old rate only could be paid. I wrote to the Commissioners asking them to supply me with the objections, so that I might justify their previous decision. No reply was sent to that. I wrote again, and after about six weeks they said that the matter was again put before the Commissioners for their special consideration. There was no word until October, 1903, when they sent a document increasing the salary to £76. They paid the arrears. I was inclined to turn to something else, and I had written to say if the arrears of salary, now so long due, were not paid, I would bring the matter before another tribunal. In three weeks I had thirty-five pounds' arrears of salary from the Board. Here is the way a further injustice comes in. They fixed the salary at £76 under the Board's rules, and they calculated my salary on their own admission that I was a second class teacher, but taking the average of my school, my salary should have been fixed at over £77. There was a long correspondence on that too. At the end of three years they gave me £1 increment, whereas I should have been promoted to the second grade at £87 for three years there. They then kept me six years and four months going from £76 to £87, and the report was highly satisfactory all the time. In my correspondence with the Board I quoted three schools in which partial increment and also promotion to teachers of a similar standing and qualifications, with no higher reports, and no higher school average for three years had been given. In one case there was a partial increment of £5. In other words they raised the salary from £74 to £87 for three years' service. That teacher was trained with me, his qualifications were 60 higher,

2nd September, 1918.]

MR. E. HARRISON EXAMINED.

[Continued.]

he had no better reports, and the average of his school was no higher. It was only pressure that got him 225. In fixing mine at 276 they did a wrong. Mr. Wyse admitted that, taking the report for 1904—I call special attention to the fact that I could not get a straight answer in any official correspondence, I do not mean from Mr. Wyse—he admitted that, taking the figures from the blue book, my salary should have been over £77. “Do you mean,” said I, “that the figures in the blue book issued to Parliament are not right?” “That is so,” said he, “that is what it comes to. Here is the explanation,” he says. “In this table, for their own purpose, they exclude infant schools in calculating results fee.” In fixing my salary at 276 they had taken the average of all including infant schools, but the results earned in my school were far higher.

21391. Mr. HARRISON.—You give this as a specimen case of hardship that was inflicted upon a certain number of teachers when the new system came into operation?—Yes, and I may say this that during the winter after leaving the training college, we all worked pretty hard to get first of first class, and since the new system came out they checked study and started agitation.

The CHAIRMAN.—That is a frank admission. Do you deeply wish to say you checked study?—Yes.

21392. Mr. HARRISON.—I think you put this case most fully?—I must say this, as regards the increment of 41 in 1906, the Commissioners had power under rule 195 to give me promotion for three years' service, and did not do it. Rule 195a says: “Teachers must, as a rule, remain three years on the maximum of a grade before becoming eligible for promotion to a higher grade.” I remained three years at 270, and the reports were satisfactory all the time. I consider that a hardship, and I say it is typical.

21393. That is an additional hardship to the one you gave before?—Perhaps it would be as well I dealt with other schools as well as my own, but I will hand in a pamphlet dealing fully with the question, and I will mark the parts of it that cover the facts.

The CHAIRMAN.—We cannot print that in the evidence.

21394. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—No, not in the evidence, but in the Appendix?—This is a pamphlet dealing with the case of the transition teachers, and the salaries under the old system, as compared with the new.

21395. The CHAIRMAN.—It will shorten the thing if you will hand it in, and we will consider it?—There is another point which shows the hardship I was under from the Commissioners at the time. We were working hard and under difficulties to get this grant for the heating and cleaning of schools.

21396. Mr. HARRISON.—Who are “we”?—The Teachers' Organisation. When I say we were working under difficulties I mean that the members of my Committee, besides doing the work of their schools, were for ever dealing with this question of heating and cleaning, scholarships for pupils, etc. Apart from our own position, I have spent, and I know other members of the Committee have spent, five and six and seven hours, night after night in dealing with such questions. So far as this grant is concerned, we got so help from the Commissioners in trying to secure it. We went on deputations to various bodies of managers, to the Church of Ireland (including Canon Mahaffy), and members of the Presbyterian body, and members of the Catholic Clerical body. We were deputed to visit upon Sir Edward Carson, Mr. John Redmond, and Mr. Dillon, with a view to getting their influence. I was directed by wire to meet Mr. John Redmond and Mr. Dillon here in Dublin in 1910. I came to Dublin. I was only two days away from school, but that year I had more than the 100 days' attendance required by the Treasury. The Commissioners, although they had power to regard those two days as vacation days, cut my salary for the two days, and at the end of the triennial period, on account of those two days, they dated my increment from the 3rd of April instead of from the 1st in 1911.

21397. Mr. HARRISON.—Was the school closed during your absence?—As a matter of fact, it was open. It was in charge of the junior assistant, but the day could not count, since the junior assistant was not certificated.

21398. Were you, by an absence of that sort, violating any rule?—No.

The CHAIRMAN.—Rule 92 is the one relating to absences.

21399. Mr. HARRISON.—Ought you to have got the sanction of the manager?—Yes, I got the sanction of the manager.

The CHAIRMAN.—The rule says: “For occasional brief absences of teachers, owing to illness or other reasonable cause, the manager's statement may be accepted.”

21400. Mr. HARRISON.—The manager approved of your absence?—Yes.

21401. And the practical work of the school being closed?—I'll tell you exactly what occurred—

21402. Did the manager realise that these two days were being deducted from your salary?—He sent a communication to the Board, and it was quite clear I had more than the 100 days, which the Treasury required. Then a note was put in the annual returns, again pointing to the fact that this money had been deducted.

21403. Mr. HENKLE.—When sending up the quarterly returns, in which you had to give returns of those two days, what did you put in to account for your absence?—This is the substance of it: “Attending deputation to Parliamentary leaders as the grant for heating and cleaning of the schools. Manager's permission given.”

21404. Mr. HARRISON.—The manager protested against this deduction from your salary. What answer was given to that protest?—I cannot tell. The only thing I know is that I did not get the salary.

21405. But surely if the manager protested that this was by his approval, and in accordance with the ordinary rules of the code, there would be some answer to that protest?—The manager drew attention to it in this way—I also pointed to the excuse given by me in this document signed by the manager, which went to the Board in the ordinary return. In that way I drew attention to it, but at the end of the year a similar note was made at the side of the annual returns, drawing the attention of the Board to the fact that the school was open for upwards of 100 days.

21406. Do I understand the manager, on your report to him that you had really been fined and suffered deduction owing to your absence of these two days, wrote to the Board?—So far as I remember, he wrote to the Board. But I am not quite sure of that. (Correspondence handed in later.)

21407. But it is a very important point?—Well, of course, many important points crop up. I never expected to be questioned on that point. I shall look up for correspondence.

21408. But it is extremely important. You are making a charge against the Board, it is extremely important that we should know whether the Board had a protest before them, and whether they answered that protest. Is it not?—In the first place, the reason given that I had the manager's permission to attend upon that particular deputation and the objects of the deputation were stated in the returns which went first to the Board.

21409. Mr. HENKLE.—In the quarterly returns?—Yes, and at the end of the year I said that I had satisfied the Treasury regulations of having upwards of 100 days' attendance, and there was a further note, and this document was also signed by the manager, and in April, 1911, while they must have known of this implied protest by the manager, they dated my increment as from the 3rd in place of from the 1st of April.

21410. Mr. HARRISON.—But you are not sure that any protest was made against that, because it might have been the action of a clerk which would not have been confirmed by his superiors, and you cannot blame the Board if you do not protest against it?—I know in this way—in 1911 we understood that Mr. Wyse had charge of the increments. He must have known my increment dated from the 3rd April instead of from the 1st. That could not have been done without his notice.

21411. I cannot be certain of that, considering the number of cases he has to deal with. He must be some extent dependent upon clerks. A clerk might have done that in the ordinary way?—I consider it would be a very big matter to place in the hands of a clerk. This case is also typical.

2nd September, 1913.]

Mr. E. MANFIELD examined.

[Continued.]

21413. The CHAIRMAN.—We need not pursue that matter further, we have got the facts now, and perhaps we may go on to another point—I can get finished with my own case by just one or two other matters. There are two "very goods" in 1906 and 1907.

21418. Mr. HARRISON.—You gave us that very fully in your evidence?—Yes, but Mr. Welby says why did I not speak. Well, Mr. McEneaney was a fair man, and although I felt annoyed that the report was lowered, I said that as a representative teacher there is no good grumbling over personal matters. Indeed, I could not, because the report was delayed about seven weeks, and I did not know still then the mark given. The average delay for years would be about seven weeks.

21414. The CHAIRMAN.—That is to say, between the date of the inspection visit and the reception of the report by the managers?—Yes, about seven weeks, and I did not delay the returns.

21415. Sometimes the delay is caused in that way?—As a rule there is no such delay. I made inquiries of the teachers concerned in the Tipperary memorial, and in other cases, and they said they did not delay the returns.

21416. That ends your personal case?—Yes, but just one point to show the contrast between the old and the new systems. My predecessor of the same class had a salary of upwards of £190 a year in the Clifton Boys' School.

21417. Would not he have been promoted later in the service than you?

Mr. HENRY.—There was no increment then.

Mr. HARRISON.—You mean he would have had the whole time he was in that school?

Mr. HENRY.—He might have.

Witness.—I could have got the same class after two years' service. I was entitled to it when appointed principal.

Mr. CORRY.—As a matter of fact, he had that salary while in that school.

21418. Mr. HARRISON.—Of course, you make that complaint as showing that some of the new teachers were hit very hard by the introduction of the new scale of promotion in 1907?—Yes, a big number.

21419. And you repudiate yourself as among them in so far as you had really entered the Training College before there was any idea of change?—Not merely entered, but I was trained for nine months before April, 1900. I was fully trained, and actually in the service of the Board before this came out. Of course, I got the special consideration, but there were a number of teachers in training with me that did not get special consideration. There were other teachers who were harder hit, much harder, than I was.

21420. The CHAIRMAN.—Do you intend, Mr. Mansfield, to give us some guidance as to the needs for reform?—Yes, I intend to deal generally with that. As regards rules with which I have been dealing, and the introduction of new ones, I feel that some notice should be given to the teachers of these rules and changes, and that they should be laid upon the table of the House of Commons before receiving sanction.

21421. Of course, all this is now rather ancient history. It is thirteen years since the new policy was introduced?—Yes, but the Board is quite capable by a policy of interference with the vested rights of teachers, to do the same again.

21422. Mr. HARRISON.—That is a point we are looking to you to develop?—Yes, I'll develop that point. I have some notes here dealing with the Clonmel circuit.

21423. Mr. CORRY.—Is this on the ground of vested rights?—In dealing with the Clonmel circuit, I think I should like to answer the statements given in the appendix by Mr. Welby and other officials of the Board. First of all, as to the general lowering of reports on the Clonmel circuit, and the failure of appeals to the Board, and then as to the investigations led by Mr. Hynes and Dr. Sturkie.

21424. Mr. HARRISON.—We have had the fullest evidence from the teachers of the Clonmel circuit on all that, and unless you are prepared to give us something new, it won't strengthen your case at all. We have had at least four or five witnesses?—

The CHAIRMAN.—Far more than that.

Mr. HENRY.—Ten or twelve.

Witness.—There are one or two points in the letter, page 211, second paragraph, to which I should like to refer. Mr. Welby says in that letter—"Mr. Mansfield makes other complaints now for the first time about this inspection," but in his letter of the 30/11/10 to me he begins: "In connection with the inspection, there are some circumstances—I do not refer to your work." He implies there I had no complaint at all against his examination. Now, why did I put in that reference then?—It was for this reason, the manager asked me to know out the references to Mr. Welby's methods, and on his suggestion I left out those. Now, may I say this, I did not know exactly what mark I would get, and I had the idea at the time of appealing not merely against the conditions under which he examined, but against the actual examination. I received the report on the 16th January. My aim clearly was that. I was just pointing out to him that I did not go into that question now, but he wishes to convey the impression that I had no objection against his methods. I was merely not putting in a reference to his methods until I got the examination report. He wanted to convey there the opposite meaning to what I intended. Of course, he gave the Board that meaning.

21425. Mr. HARRISON.—I am bound to say it is the obvious meaning to be put upon it?—But that was what the manager asked me to do.

21426. He did not know that. I do not think that is stating the point very much?—I do not wish to make out that Mr. Welby meant to be unfair, but, considering the circumstances, it is unfair to me to leave it without an explanation. Again, he says that the inspectors are inefficient, yet, in his letter later, he referred to me as an examiner who put questions in a capable style. Now, Mr. Welby is on one moon, and his questions were put carefully, but coldly, in an unsympathetic manner, like a machine; but that is not saying that he is a good inspector. My idea of an inspector is, that he should help the teacher of the school, and that where there was a fault he should discuss it. I must honestly say that my conception of inspection is wider than the mere putting of questions.

I don't think we need develop that.

21427. The CHAIRMAN.—I do not want to curtail your statement, but I was looking forward to getting some help from you?—Yes, but we have been attacked very unfairly in this document, and the Clonmel teachers feel this will remain unless there is an explanation.

Mr. HARRISON.—The Clonmel teachers have given their evidence, and they fairly availed themselves of the opportunity.

21428. The CHAIRMAN.—Surely you will admit that we have given them the very fullest hearing?—That is so. I suppose you have had evidence—it is notorious for Mr. Welby states it—that we sent a deputation to the managers. He says they did not interfere. Well, that is not so. Canon Dúno, Parish Priest of Murroe, Secretary of the Council of Catholic Clerical Managers, sent a resolution to the Board asking for an investigation. Mr. Welby says we sent the managers a deputation. That also is untrue. He also quotes a number of junior inspectors, and inspectors on probation, and Mr. Fitzpatrick who was there for a year is not referred to at all.

21429. Just as to the state of education?—We believe his influence is clear throughout this report, and it is clear also from the marks given by Mr. Yates, and the reference to the Templemore School, where the report was lowered from "very good" to "fair," and where Mr. Welby states in this document Mr. Yates agreed with him. Mr. Yates was simply sobbing the words of Mr. Welby, and, I think, quoting a number of those junior inspectors under these conditions should not carry much weight.

21430. Mr. HENRY.—That was gone into very fully by previous witnesses?—In the printed evidence Mr. Hynes says on page 215—"His (Mr. Mansfield's) references to his senior inspector are in bad taste, and he makes a serious indictment against the Board when he says: 'The general opinion among us (the teachers) is that he (Mr. Welby) was qualifying for the chief

inspectors by the severity which placed him in the seclusion. He plainly intimates here that the Commissioners promoted Mr. Welby because he was harsh to the teachers. If a public utterance of this kind by a teacher is allowed to go unpunished the effect upon the teaching body in general will be most injurious." Now, this was a privileged letter sent to the Board through our County Secretary at the Board's request, and he wishes me to be punished for this opinion supplied to the Board in a private and confidential document. If you turn to page 204 you will see there that Mr. Keegan wrote—"In reply to your letter of the 21st ult., I beg to enclose herewith statement of complaint from the following teachers, etc." Mr. Keegan asked me for this statement regarding Mr. Welby. I sent it to, and it was sent to the Board, and at the end of the second column, page 204, I say—"There, of course, as senior, he had more scope, and the general opinion among us is that he was qualifying for the chief inspectorship by the severity which placed him in the seclusion." I say that was a privileged document sent to the Board, and now Mr. Hynes wishes me to be severely dealt with because of what he calls a public attack upon the Commissioners. I consider that unfair on the part of Mr. Hynes. I don't complain of Mr. Hynes's examination of my school. I think him fair; but I think it unjust for a man in his position to write that.

21431. The CHAIRMAN.—You say you wrote that for the eyes of the Commissioners at their own request?—Yes.

21432. Mr. HANMON.—That opinion was not a publicly expressed opinion?—No.

21433. Not publicly expressed at any meeting of the teachers before?—I expressed similar views elsewhere.

21434. Not in a private capacity?—Not in a private capacity. At the Benger Congress, in my address as President, Mr. Welby's name did not come in, but I dealt pretty strongly with the inspection system, and I know at the time we were considering to take action. So that very much the same views had been expressed publicly, although in this particular case their words were in a private letter to the Commissioners.

21435. Mr. HANMON.—Did you ever use the same form of words previously?—No; Mr. Welby's name was not mentioned in my presidential address.

21436. Mr. CORRY.—The reference in your address at Benger to the promotion of inspectors generally did not refer particularly to Mr. Welby?—No.

21437. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—There is a very serious point which has been exercising me a good deal; that is the views you and other teachers take with regard to allegations against the Board. You think you have answered the whole of that by saying this is a privileged communication, but you have not answered one of the most serious points, and that is that you were making an accusation against the Board of going to promote a man, not upon his merits, but for his severity to the teachers. Don't you consider that was an insult to the Board? I consider from the practice of the Board the statement was fully justified.

21438. You don't seem in your answer at all to realise the fact that it was an insult?—Well, it was true; you have it here in evidence that Mr. Welby and Mr. Macmillan were regarded by the teachers as extremely severe, and I believe Mr. Welby got promotion over the heads of larger service men. I have further particulars—

21439. The point I want to make is this. If the teachers make a statement like that they ought to be fully aware of the gravity of what they are saying, and I must say, on this examination of yours, you didn't at first seem to fully realise that it was an extremely grave statement to make?—I quite recognise the gravity of the case. We tried every possible means to get the state of affairs in Clonsilla remedied; we were ignored, and it was only in an extreme case that these measures were taken.

21440. Don't you think any inspector commenting upon any statement of that sort was justified in referring to it in very strong terms? I admit that, but why call it a "public utterance." He refers to the licence of language of the teachers in dealing with this case, and in the very same document he himself

calls this statement in a privileged letter a public attack upon an official.

The CHAIRMAN.—It occurs to me that it might be regarded as public, not necessarily public in the sense of being published broadcast, but as coming to all the members of the Board. This is a sort of public document.

21441. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—It is a public document in the ordinary sense?—We were asking for an extended statement in support of our memorial, and to the best of my belief, and quite honestly, I gave my views. I said, perhaps, somewhat hard things, but I believe they were perfectly justified, and nothing has since occurred to make me think they were not justified. There is another point. Mr. Hynes quotes me as saying—"His reputation—that of a hard taskmaster, cold and unsympathetic—came before him," and adds—"It was clear from this that the Tipperary teachers were not prepared to give the new inspector a fair trial." As a matter of fact, we did not touch Mr. Welby until we felt no other course was open to us but to memorial the Board to receive a deputation. If they had listened to us it would have been different, but they would not, and we had to adopt other means. Again, as regards that table, it is a very curious document. There are thirteen schools taken, and of the thirteen there were only five—we will include a girls' school referred to in first memorial, and say there were only six schools of whose merits complaint was made in the original memorial.

21442. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—Only five?—I am including the Mullinahone Girls' School.

21443. It was not referred to in the twelve cases?—It was referred to in the original memorial. You will find it on page 203.

Mr. CORRY.—Unless you have some new light to throw on this table we might pass on; it was dealt with by Dr. Sharke and Mr. Hynes.

21444. Mr. HANMON.—I don't think there is anything you can tell us about it?—There is this point about these schools. The report was raised by Mr. Hynes in four cases of our six, and as to the two others. In the case of the Mount Boys' School Mr. Welby says, and Mr. Fitzgerald agrees with him, that one of the teachers was an indifferent teacher, and the other had gone beyond the stage of being able to teach. Now, the report was raised in the Mount Boys' School by the district and senior inspectors the very next year, and in the case of the Hardyler School it was raised two steps. So much for the marking in the six cases we complained of. The reports were at once raised by Mr. Hynes in four cases, and by two other inspectors next year in the other two cases. It was not fair to include seven other schools we never appealed about. In only one of these did Mr. Hynes raise the mark.

21445. Mr. CORRY.—We asked Dr. Sharke a good deal about that?—There is a serious matter in the table, page 203. It is the table given by Mr. Welby about the firing of teachers.

21446. The CHAIRMAN.—We want to know about that. We never heard the facts about it?—

Mr. HANMON.—The "A's" and "B's" on that table do not correspond with the "A's" and "B's" designating schools in the columns that follow same page.

The CHAIRMAN.—No, they don't.

Witness.—We have got about ninety statements of complaint from teachers in Circuit 18, and among the ninety there is not a single statement from teachers referred to in this table; and there is the further fact, I have found out since, that of the ten cases there are only four who are members of our organisation. Now, take, "A teacher fined about £20." That would seem to be the most serious case; but I have a statement from the teacher of that school—

21447. The CHAIRMAN.—You know the school?—Yes.

21448. Mr. HANMON.—And you positively identify the case?—Yes, I know of this case in a general way.

21449. Mr. CORRY.—Don't give the name of the school?—No; I have not the teacher's authority to do so. I wish to have this down in evidence that these letters, A, B, C, D, and so on, do not correspond with the other letters referred to in our memorial, and there is not a single teacher who signed our memorial, or a single teacher among those sending in the ninety statements, that ever was fined by the Board.

21450. The CHAIRMAN.—I think it is better, if I may suggest it to you, that you should amend that statement, and say that the schools marked "A, B, C, D," and so on, where teachers were fined, are not to be identified with the list of schools similarly marked on the same page. That is what you mean?—Yes, on page 204.

21451. Mr. HARRISON.—You were going to tell us about school "A"?—Yes, the fine there is given as £50, but the actual fine was £38. I need not give the roll number of the school. The teacher of that school was a young lady. A junior assistant mistress had been appointed to the school. This junior assistant mistress was set down as 36 years and 9 months. Under the rules of the Board pupil teachers, monitors, and mistresses may remain upon the roll until they finish their courses. Although they may have served out three periods there is no distinction made in their case. As a rule pupils must be struck off at 18, but in the case of those teachers to whom I have referred, these pupil teachers and mistresses remain upon the roll and their attendances count until they finished their period of apprenticeship. Now, this teacher was under the impression, and she asked the district inspector, that this junior assistant mistress might remain upon the roll, as necessarily pupil teachers were allowed to remain. The district inspector said "yes"; that he saw nothing against it. The principal had her name put upon the roll, and her attendances were reckoned. Mr. Welby was appointed afterwards, and it was his practice to go back in the books a number of years—this particular matter had not occurred in Mr. Welby's time at all—he looked over the returns for some years, and found there were a couple of quarters for which the average would not have been 85, but for the inclusion of the attendances of the junior assistant mistress. If the average had been under 85 for two quarters the junior assistant would have to go. He found she would have had to go, but for reckoning her own attendances, which were included under the direction of the other district inspector. He reported the matter to the Board. I don't know what his recommendations were, but the result was, in any case, that for the length of time the junior assistant mistress was retained, the principal of the school had to refund the salary of the junior assistant mistress, which amounted to £35.

21452. The CHAIRMAN.—That is the meaning of that fine?—Yes; that is the meaning of that fine. And afterwards one of the chiefs of inspection brought the matter under the Board's notice, and the portion not then paid was remitted by the Board. I know the chief of inspection thought it a hardship on the teacher.

21453. Mr. HARRISON.—There was no fraud?—No, there was no fraud.

21454. Mr. HENRY.—It amounted to this, that the money was paid under a misapprehension, and that money had to be refunded?—It means that the principal of the school, out of a miserable salary, had to refund £35, or was directed to refund it, because of a mistake made by a district inspector in interpreting the Board's rules.

21455. Mr. COFFEY.—It is well to know it was not a fine for an offence?—It was a most serious fine for the lady. There are other schools there of unassociated teachers, and I have not asked for an explanation from those teachers.

21456. The CHAIRMAN.—You have none to give us in their cases?—No, but even if I had I would not touch their cases at all.

21457. That is the one case with which you wish to deal?—That is the one case in which I know the facts fully, and the most serious. There are one or two cases of similar fines, but I did not care really to apply to the teachers for explanations.

21458. Mr. HENRY.—Can you distinguish the cases of teachers outside the Organisation?—I can.

21459. Only two of your members were affected?—More, A, B, D, and E. B, D and E were each fined 45, and A £38.

21460. Mr. HARRISON.—It says about £30?—Well, £35 was the salary; and I may say the other cases

were those of teachers who were newly appointed. It has been said these occurred in two years, but they extended over a number of years.

21461. Mr. HARRISON.—Are you in a position now to take the general case?—I have notes upon examinations in general.

21462. I presume what you are going to give us embodies the considered opinion of the teachers, does it?—In so far as I could find out the views of the teachers. I am trying honestly to express their views to the best of my ability.

21463. The CHAIRMAN.—That is upon general principles?—Yes. Of course, there is another case about my own decision by the Board.

21464. Will you allow that for a moment to stand on one side, for another member of the Commission will examine you upon that?—Very well. Now, with regard to the administration, we consider it is very costly. The cost of the inspection system and office administration in Ireland would be roughly £80,000.

21465. Do you include in that the whole office work and staff?—Yes.

21466. Mr. HARRISON.—Inside and outside staff?—Yes, indoor and outdoor. The total grant for Ireland roughly amounts to £1,000,000. In Scotland, where they get roughly £2,500,000 from the Imperial Exchequer and about £2,000,000 from local rates, that is about £4,500,000, they spend about £75,000 on these items of expenditure.

21467. The CHAIRMAN.—Then you will have to compare the number of children?—Roughly, there are about 50 per cent. more in attendance in the Scottish than in the Irish schools, and further, while I have given the cost of administration and inspection on the primary system alone in Ireland, I have given the cost of primary, secondary, and technical schools in Scotland. In other words, the inspection of primary schools in Ireland costs about £7,000 a year more than the total cost of primary, intermediate—their type of intermediate schools differs from our—higher grade schools, and technical schools in Scotland.

21468. Mr. HARRISON.—Have you calculated how much is spent by local authorities on schools, because you must remember that those funds raised by the rates are administered by the localities, and that they have got their own special administration, their own Education Committees, and in some cases their own inspection. Have you considered that?—Yes.

21469. The CHAIRMAN.—The staff in London would be very large?—

21470. Mr. HARRISON.—And, of course, that local administration so doubt saves the central administration very considerable expenditure?—The fact remains at the same time that the Scottish Education Department considers £75,000 quite sufficient to operate the expenditure of £2,500,000, leaving aside local contributions, whereas in Ireland £80,000 is spent on the distribution of £2,000,000.

21471. Of course, it is much more highly centralised in Ireland, and you must remember that an enormous amount of routine work is taken off the central authority in Scotland by the local authorities. So that if you are to institute a perfectly fair comparison you must go into all these circumstances. What is the next point?—The Board is not responsible to public opinion; it is not responsible to the Government; it is not responsible to Parliament. It can even refuse returns to Parliament.

21472. I think we are perfectly well aware it is a unique body?—And under a system like that irresponsibility tends in the direction of tyranny. It is a curious thing that the Irish people, who pay, of course, though the money comes via London, for the education of their children have no more control over education in this country than the Chinese.

21473. The CHAIRMAN.—Of course, you are aware that is outside our terms of reference?—Well, with regard to the rule-making powers of the Board, I don't know whether that comes within your terms of reference or whether you can make recommendations with regard to the rates.

21474. Mr. HARRISON.—We have had a great deal of evidence about that, and we should like to know exactly what the teachers' point of view is and what

2nd September, 1918.]

Mr. E. MANSFIELD continued.

[Continued.]

they recommended?—I should like you to make more sweeping recommendations than would come within the terms of your reference. The only really effective reform will be the removal of the present Board, and substituting a representative Council. We believe that notice should be given of the rules, and that those rules should be laid upon the table of the House of Commons before enactment, as in the case of the Intermediate Board. There would then be some check.

21475. The CHAIRMAN.—Do you think that would be the best mode of procedure?—I am giving you my idea.

21476. To lie upon the table of the House of Commons for 40 days?—Yes.

21477. But it has been put to us there is nobody there to defend the rules?—Well, Mr. Birrell calls himself the megaphone of all the departments in Ireland.

21478. Does he regard himself as the defender of the Board?—He says he very often has to defend things he does not know anything about.

21479. Mr. HENRY.—And that he sometimes plays the wrong tune?—

21480. Mr. COVER.—There are no statements Mr. Birrell makes himself on these matters; they are supplied to him by the Education Office?—Of course. Take the letter of Dr. Beatty, charging the Board with wilful misstatement. Again in 1908 the Board in its report committed itself of giving wrong returns to Parliament. About that time we heard complaints that a large number of teachers were being run out with little or no pension, and I asked Mr. Thomas O'Donnell, M.P., to get a return of the number of teachers dismissed since 1900. We found the dismissals had increased at an alarming rate. The rate at that time was 68, and the average for three years was over 60. The Board dealt with that subject in 1905 in its report, and yet if you look at the table of dismissals by the Board in their report they are far less than in the return they furnished to Parliament. In its own report the Board had convicted itself of giving false returns upon this question of dismissals.

21481. The CHAIRMAN.—I have read that report, but they admit in the report that 55 teachers have been dismissed in that year?—They admitted 50 as the average for the three years, but the average for the years 1897, 1898, and 1899 would be one-third of the average for the three next, and the average for the year following that would be double the three preceding years. They said it was a small proportion.

21482. One in two hundred and fifty?—Fifty in 12,500, that is one in 250, but you must consider the fact that the risk is one in 240 each year, and as the average service for pension is 40 years, it would roughly mean, that one teacher in seven would be dismissed during the period of service.

21483. Mr. HARRISON.—What is the average life of teachers as teachers?—Well, 40 years, roughly, would be the period of service for pension.

21484. But if you are going to take the average it would be less than that?—It would be somewhat less, but I don't suppose you will find any other public State service in which the number of dismissals is so large, and besides the number of dismissals written down as official would not indicate it; the number of old teachers who retire through fear of being dismissed would not be included. I have seen old teachers who did good work under the old system who retired through fear of dismissal. I was trained and came out in 1879. There was a new programme issued by the Board, and I was absolutely unfitted to teach four of the subjects the Board considered obligatory.

21485. Mr. MURPHY.—And you got special distinction?—Yes, and first place that year, and I was supposed to be up to the average, yet I was absolutely unfitted to teach some of the subjects. I had to attend classes in winter, getting home at all hours and getting wet through, to pick up scraps of information at carpenter's classes. What, then, was to become of the old teachers in such circumstances? Some tried to learn drill, some to learn singing, because the Board's inspectors considered everyone should sing.

21486. The CHAIRMAN.—Can you point to any statistic of the number of teachers dismissed in 1903?—The average would be over 50.

21487. Not dismissed for inefficiency?—They give the numbers as dismissed by the inspectors and the Board combined in their report as less than the number dismissed by the Board, as given in the return to Parliament. Of course, that is a matter of fact. I intended looking it up and having it ready.

21488. We will look it up?—A number of teachers were in a pitiable state at that time. It was simply scandalous. They got home at midnight in the depth of winter from attending singing classes and drill classes organized, some by the Board and some by the teachers.

21489. How far had you to go?—Seven English miles. I got wet night after night, and I got a bad throat from attempting to attend singing classes in such circumstances—and I was supposed to be trained a year before.

21490. Mr. HARRISON.—What is the next point?—That the Board has no respect for the rights of teachers. I told you about the transition teachers already. Those men, who entered the service of the Board under special conditions, had those conditions set aside on the introduction of the new system, though every teacher in the Training College was bound by contract to serve the Board or to give a return of the money that was spent on his training.

21491. Mr. HENRY.—Serve the Board for how long?—For two years. They were bound to serve the Board by that guarantee, yet the Board broke those conditions. I quote Rule 137 (b) as another example of interfering with the vested rights of teachers. Leaving aside the merits of the rule altogether, I believe it was most unfair of the Board to reduce the salaries of the teachers considerably through the operation of this rule, which was never dreamt of until Mr. Dale visited Ireland in 1903. You have already in evidence from Mr. O'Donnell, Tipperary, two letters which were handed in, one refusing exemption of his school under this rule and the other threatening him with the withdrawal of salary if the average reduced by the rule was not up for a particular quarter. I know another teacher whose salary was reduced to £95 from upwards of £100. Numbers of teachers were deprived of capitulation also through its operation. You have a remarkable case in the diocese of Limerick of the boys remaining in the boys' school by the orders of the ecclesiastical authorities. The teacher has to teach them the secular as well as the religious programme, but really he dare not put them in the books and calculate their attendance in his returns to the Board. They are non-existent so far as the teacher's salary or promotion is concerned, but in so far as the work has to be done they are in the school and have to be taught by the male teacher.

21492. Mr. COVER.—Are they inspected and examined by the inspector?—Yes; actually examined by the inspector. Of course, there is a big sum going back to the Treasury each year from the loss which the teachers suffer every year in capitulation and promotion through the operation of that rule, 137 (b). Some might be inclined to defend it on educational grounds. They say, of course, women make better teachers of infants and young children than men, but the Board's remedy was to introduce a number of junior assistant mistresses whose chief qualification was singing and ability to pass a fourth or fifth standard programme. Supposing we do admit that such women make better teachers of young children—I don't admit it—look at the effect of the rule on the education of boys as a whole. The average of the boys' school is reduced, the prospects of the teacher are destroyed, salary and promotion are reduced, and as Sir Robert Meent says in one of his reports, the qualification of the teacher will in the main depend on the question of salary. With the teacher's salary reduced it is clear you will have an inferior type coming in, and whatever advantage there may be from the employment of women in the teaching of very young boys—I don't admit any—it will be more than counterbalanced by the loss to education through the employment of inferior men owing to the operation of this rule. We never heard of this rule until Mr. Dale came over in 1903. Of course, Mr. Dale is an extremely able man,

but it struck the teachers and others at that time, and there is borne out by a speech of Dr. Starke, that he was sent across by the Treasury at that time to make a case for the continuation of the Development Grant.

21493. Mr. HARRISON.—I think you need not go into that, because Mr. Dale decidedly told us here that he had no instructions whatever, and knew of no ulterior purpose whatever?—We believe Mr. Dale is an honest man and an able man, but we believe that he was the unconscious instrument of Mr. Wyndham for the continuation of the Development Grant, and this is borne out by the Belfast speech of Dr. Starke in 1911.

Mr. HARRISON.—I think you will find it hard to persuade this Committee of that in face of Mr. Dale's explicit statement.

21494. The CHAIRMAN.—And that was the very last question put to him at this table?—The statement of Dr. Starke will go rather the other way. In 1908 and in 1904 the Commissioners said that the Board had nothing whatever to do with the institution of the rule. Then the senior inspectors came together and passed a resolution in favour of a rule which was never heard of until Mr. Dale had been three months visiting the schools with Dr. Starke and other inspectors negating its principle.

21495. Your point is with regard to Mr. Dale's influence in getting this rule passed?—I am not attacking Mr. Dale particularly. I have read his report, and judging by his report I believe him to be sound on education, and to be an honest and an able man, but I believe he was the unconscious instrument of the Treasury in subsidising the £185,000 per annum that should have gone to education.

21496. Mr. COOPER.—Dr. Starke here made, to my mind, a very serious, and, I think, a very ungrounded charge against a great man who has since died, Mr. George Wyndham, and I think those who look into the matter will find that the origin of the taking away of the education grant was not due to Mr. George Wyndham?—It is clear that in 1908 Dr. Starke made the case for the Treasury in his Belfast speech.

Mr. COOPER.—Of course, there has nothing to do with our inquiry.

21497. Mr. HARRISON.—This at any rate was not first done by the Board?—Well, it shows that the Board has no regard for the rights of teachers, and further, in the mind of the teachers, if there was any advantage in this rule, which we do not admit, it will be far more than counterbalanced by the introduction of inferior men teachers.

21498. I think we have got your view quite clearly on that point?—There is another rule, 92 (j), the maturity rule—which also interferes with the vested rights of teachers.

21499. That rule was very much modified on certain representations made to the National Board?—On representations to Mr. Burrell and exposure in Parliament and elsewhere.

21500. Well, if you like to put it in that way?—It was only modified when the Chief Secretary, who is supposed to be responsible for education, said with regard to a particular case brought before him that he considered the action of the Board harsh in the extreme. It was after that that they modified it. There is another example of interference with the vested rights of teachers in the rule regarding junior assistant mistresses. They were introduced in 1900, and the Commissioners said in one of their reports their introduction was one of the greatest educational reforms of modern times. Of course, they had got rid of that type of teacher in every other country in the world except Russia, I believe, though Mr. Weply in the report of 1910-11 on the Council circuit has no praise for anybody but the junior assistant mistresses, which I think a grave reflection upon the Board. Some of these junior assistant mistresses work hard, as in my case, and help to raise the average, and are efficient. A new rule was introduced that they should go when the average was raised above 50, so that they are penalised for being efficient.

21501. The CHAIRMAN.—When they help to raise the school average above 50 they must go?—Yes.

21502. Mr. HARRISON.—How far can the raising of the average above 50 be attributed to them?—Of

course, the inspectors have stated frequently where there is a bad teacher and an efficient teacher is appointed the average of the school goes up considerably.

21503. You can say to some extent the improvement in the average in your school was due to the junior assistant mistresses. Can you show us in what way she contributed to raise the average attendance?—Well, I'll put it on these lines. I know it is nearly impossible for one man to manage alone a school of, say, 50 or 40, considering the number of classes and the number of subjects the Commissioners require; it requires a teacher of considerable ability to give even a small school attention. She kept the young children employed and raised the standard amongst the infants, and parents taking an interest in their children are far more likely to send them regularly to school when they know they are more likely to be employed fully, as they would be with a junior assistant mistress.

21504. The CHAIRMAN.—Allow me to correct what is I suppose my own wrong impression. I understood you to contend that the introduction of junior assistant mistresses was anything but an educational reform. You said it was done away with in every other country except Russia?—Yes. While I say that in a general way there are a number of junior assistant mistresses doing good work, I say the principle of introducing unqualified teachers is wrong, but you will find a number of competent mistresses who have been untrained, and some of them have been trained and are certificated.

21505. Mr. HARRISON.—I think you did not admit that they were of any great use in teaching small children?—As against the trained male teacher, I don't believe they are equal to trained men.

21506. Not even in teaching little children of six years and younger?—My point is if you take a girl who has no experience of teaching and whose educational qualifications are not, and need not be high, and put her to teach a class of infants, I believe she cannot do it as well as a trained and experienced man.

21507. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—The point was, I think, brought out before, but I would like to put it in this way to you. If the Board consider they cannot afford in a school such as yours was before the improvement took place, to pay for a fully qualified teacher were they not right in putting an unqualified teacher in, and would not an unqualified teacher assist you better in school than if you were left alone?—Oh, certainly, but teaching requires skilled workers.

21508. Then comes the point that the presence of that unqualified teacher did assist you in raising the attendance?—Yes.

21509. And it would be an injustice to the person who assisted in bringing that about to have her efforts turned against herself?—Yes.

21510. You agree with that point. You are aware in some cases where there is an assistant teacher allowed for a certain number of pupils when the number of pupils falls below that standard they are not dismissed, but are allowed to remain on until the number is reduced still more?—Yes, that is so.

21511. Would it not be a proper rule to introduce that since junior assistant mistresses are recognised, that in a school where the number increases to such a point that they would not be appointed to that school, yet if they have been appointed before the number has reached it that they should continue until the number reaches a still higher point?—That would go some way to meet the difficulty; there is a possibility of justice in that.

21512. Would not that rule meet the case, as in the other case?—In the other case you are safeguarding the interest of the teacher, and of education.

21513. Would not such a rule meet the case of the junior assistant mistresses?—It would be a big improvement on the present, but the important thing is that there ought to be a better salary or an age limit in the case of a teacher earning £24 or £26 a year. It is to a certain extent degrading to a teacher not to education itself that a teacher should continue to the end of her days on £26 a year.

2nd September, 1933.]

Mr. E. MANSFIELD continued.

[Continued.]

21514. The CHAIRMAN.—What is the next point you wish to deal with?—It is with regard to the teachers in Irish-speaking districts where the Board has interfered with the rights of the teachers, too.

Mr. HANNAH.—Before coming to that may I ask would it not be better that the junior assistant mistress should try and qualify for the position of assistant?—

21515. Mr. HANNAH.—Qualify by examination?—Yes, but that rule should not be allowed to interfere with those who entered under certain specific conditions. It is a clear case of injustice where a teacher has entered under certain conditions and because she has done good work she must be allowed to go. It would not occur in any other department of the public service. The people in England would not tolerate that sort of thing.

21516. I am afraid we had very similar cases under what was known as article 98, teachers who are absolutely in the non-effective service?—Yes, but did they not know the conditions under which they joined, and have these conditions been departed from?

21517. Not that I know of. Of course, what I don't know is how far the Board in Ireland have endeavoured to induce girls to come in as junior assistant mistresses with these prospects?—In seven years they have induced 2,500 altogether to come in.

21518. Yes, but did they hold out any inducements to them which they have failed to carry out?—Yes.

21519. How?—They come in unconditionally, being granted salaries of £34, with an increase of £4. There was no statement that they would be got rid of if the average went up, but if the average remained over 35 they would remain as assistant mistresses. Then a new rule was introduced dismissing them if the average went up to 36.

21520. I do not see that it is departing from a condition, because no conditions were absolutely laid down. Except in certain schools which fulfilled certain conditions these people could be employed, but they were given no guarantee of continued service?—There is no guarantee of continued service even to the inspectors of the Board.

21521. Yes, they have practically during good conduct?—Well, don't you think the same rule of justice should apply to junior assistant mistresses?

21522. It depends entirely on what conditions they were induced to enter the service. I don't see from your evidence that faith was broken, because nothing was promised them. A tradesman who probably spent a good deal upon his education and that sort of thing with special conditions thrown upon him, is a different case altogether?—Yes, but I do not see why equal justice should not be applied to the junior assistant mistress as well as to the teacher of £230 a year or the inspector of £300 a year.

21523. It is simply a contract with the one and not even an implied contract with the other, but I don't think we need argue it?—I should consider it an injustice if the Board said to me, your school has an average of 150. You must go, because we want a graduate. Why treat her differently?

21524. But they will accept that junior assistant mistress in another school?—Yes, but there is the difficulty of getting her a place.

21525-6. The CHAIRMAN.—Let us get on now to the next point?—There is interference with the vested rights of teachers in Irish-speaking districts. They entered the service under certain conditions. Some years ago under pressure from the Gaelic League and other bodies the Board insisted on introducing a bilingual programme which those teachers were not fit to teach on their training, and they got notice if they were not qualified to teach a language they did not know and a bilingual programme which many Irish-speaking teachers did not know how to deal with, their services would be dispensed with. We had two cases down in Ring near Dungarran, in Irish-speaking districts. We have a training college in Waterford, and during my time of training there was a young man in the college with me who is now the principal of the King school. He had a knowledge of Irish. A number of students were anxious to be taught Irish, but the training college did not make proper provision. Of

course, I do not blame the college but the Board. This teacher was appointed principal, yet because he was not able to teach the Irish language, for which there was no provision made in the training college, he was to be penalised by the Board.

21527. What was the penalty?—To give up his school.

21528. Of course, he was eligible for employment anywhere else?—Oh, yes; a cold alternative.

21529. Had he to give up his school?—He would have had to do so but that he went to the Irish College at Ballynagarry and learned the Irish language.

21530. Was not that an almost necessary corollary of introducing Irish into the schools?—It could be done in a different way. If the Board wanted it they should have made proper provision for the training of teachers in their colleges.

21531. At the time he was training there was no idea of having Irish taught?—Oh, yes. A number of us went to the principal, who refused, asking him to have Irish taught, and a number studied it during recreation hours. The case was much worse in the neighbouring school.

21532. Have there been many cases?—There have been several in Waterford and other districts.

21533. Where teachers who did not speak Irish had to leave because they lived in Irish-speaking districts?—They were threatened, and the Board did not actually carry out the threats. The point I want to make is the injustice of the new conditions and that they are calculated to penalise the teachers.

21534. Not in a pecuniary way?—Yes; this gentleman in Ring is a good teacher and his reports were valued considerably, and he attributes the reduction to the policy of the Board and the inspectors.

21535. An efficient teacher with a bilingual programme is favourably considered in connection with increment and promotion under Rule 121?—Yes; so say the rules.

21536. Is Irish not properly taught in any of the training colleges? There surely are some of those where it is properly taught?—There is no regulation of the Board insisting on its being taught in the training colleges. It is optional, and where the programme is so wide it is very little use for the training colleges to introduce a subject that is not compulsory.

21537. What is your next point?—That the Board has very little sympathy with the teacher. They profess to be ready to improve our salary, yet at the time of agitating for the augmentation grant which we gained in 1928, the Board issued a report in 1929 trying to institute a comparison between the salaries of teachers in Ireland and those in Great Britain and to make out that our salaries were very good considering the size of the schools. The Board went as far as the Island of Lewis to justify the Treasury.

21538. Is that in one of their reports?—Oh, yes. Again, in 1925 they stated in their report that no teacher is to be recommended for promotion whose school is not above reproach in point of sanitation.

21539. Mr. HANNAH.—Can you give any case where that rule has been improperly applied to the detriment of the teacher, who could not help the state of the school?—I could quote one case of a teacher in our own county who was told distinctly by Mr. Welfy that next year unless there was a new and better building he could not possibly expect a good report.

21540. Had that to do with sanitation or with the general arrangements of the building?—We hold a teacher should not be held responsible for sanitation or building.

21541. Sanitation may mean different things. It may mean general arrangements or the cleanliness with which those are used, and does seem to come within the teacher's province?—If a school is to be above reproach in point of sanitation surely there is more than the teacher's duty noted there.

21542. What we want to know is: if you make a charge of that sort have you any concrete case to show that any particular teacher has been held responsible for a state of things he could not have avoided himself?—I'll tell you what occurred in my own school. A senior inspector came in; he looked round; there were some old maps on the walls; he said, "Now, Mr. Mansfield, you are doing good work—in fact, too much

2nd September, 1913.]

Mr. R. MARSHALL examined.

[Continued.]

work. If you attended a little more to the schoolroom and got a few maps, and to the shrubs and these things outside, it would be better. I know Dr. Service looks to these things."

21543. But we are on sanitation at present?—I thought you were dealing with adverse circumstances.

21544. You said sanitation?—The report says the Inspector cannot recommend a teacher for promotion whose school is not above approach in point of sanitation. We held that a teacher should not be responsible for the sanitary conditions of the school.

21545. Can you give us any case where a teacher has been held responsible and has been marked unfairly?—Here are the positive directions.

21546. But we want a concrete case?—I'll put it in another way—

21547. Is it not possible that a teacher might be fairly and properly marked supposing it is found that the outside buildings are in a very dirty state and improperly used. Surely you would allow that to be the teacher's fault?—Yes, but "shows approach." I'll tell of a case where salary was kept from teachers because there were no cut-offices.

21548. No cut-offices at all?—No; in Newtown Schools, Tipperary. There was a question asked in Parliament on the subject by the late Mr. Keadell O'Brien, and the facts were admitted in the answer to that question.

21549. I should have thought in that case the position would have been not to recognise the school at all?—The school had been recognised. There is another rather important point that I want to make. A comparison is made regarding marking between the Castlebar circuit and the circuits in the rest of Ireland. Mr. MacNeill was questioned upon that, and he stated that the adverse circumstances told in favour of the teacher, yet he attempted to justify the lowering of the reports in the Castlebar district because of the adverse conditions under which the teachers have to do their work. He was being questioned on uniformity.

21550. It is perfectly possible bad premiums may affect the work to a point that no Inspector could ignore. There is nothing much in that?—But teachers in that district work equally hard, and they are hampered by having a lowered average attendance due to adverse conditions, yet he attempts to justify the lowering of the marks from "good" and "excellent" by the very adverse circumstances and conditions of the people in Mayo. Then you have the circular handed in by Mr. Power in which he states that for an "excellent" or "very good" mark a school building should be in very good condition.

21551. The CHAIRMAN.—It is an analysis of the term "excellent"?—Yes, that the building should be of a good class and should be in good repair.

21552. Mr. HARRISON.—Of course, that is the great difficulty of grading schools of which we have heard a great deal, and upon which most of us have formed pretty definite conclusions?—A want of sympathy has been shown in another matter; that is in the slow promotion of assistant teachers to second grade. During twelve years, although it has appeared recently from an answer of Mr. Birrell no change was made as regards Treasury interference, they promoted two assistant teachers only in twelve years. Since then without any special sanction they promoted between 60 and 100. They have the power to promote assistants, but in twelve years they promoted two. The report of the Commissioners proves there are between 1,800 and 1,900 vacancies in the second grade. You have about 5,000 vacancies in the third grade.

21553. The CHAIRMAN.—How many years did it take to promote two assistants?—About 12 years, with 1,800 or 1,900 vacancies in the second grade. We have about 70 per cent. of the teachers in the third year, and these vacancies existed which the Commissioners might have filled, but did not.

21554. The CHAIRMAN.—How many years did it take instead to principal teachers, or would the promotion of a certain number of assistants not have affected the number of principals?—There were 1,800 or 1,900 vacancies.

21555. So they might have promoted some assistants without affecting the principals? Is that so?—Yes, that is so. We believe it was due to the exposure of

the matter made in a pamphlet which we prepared last year for the debate on the Irish Education estimates and sent to the Irish representatives and to Mr. Birrell that the facts came out and the improvement took place. I have touched already on the question of partial increments. There is no rule on partial increments in the regulations. It is an extraordinary thing to give a man £1 for three years' work, as was done in my own case, the increment to the second grade being £10.

21556. Partial increments are only given. I presume, at the time of the change when certain claims were made?—This partial increment was given to me in 1905.

21557. Are there any partial increments now to teachers who were appointed since 1905?—Yes. If a teacher is £1 or £2 below the maximum of the grade they give him that £1 or £2 to bring him up to the maximum, and this is regarded as in the nature of an increment. I have glanced over the second volume of evidence, I had not time to examine it very closely, but it seems to me the Commissioners guaranteed an intended saving of £50,000 per annum through the introduction of this new system.

21558. What is your point upon that?—Well, the salaries are so low considering the importance of the teachers' calling, and they are so poor in comparison with the salaries of the teachers in Great Britain although we are living under the same Constitution. Then again we have to consider the increased cost of living. I think in all these circumstances it was a most extraordinary thing for the Commissioners to agree to this saving of £50,000 per annum.

21559. Is it your point they deliberately sacrificed £50,000 which they might have kept, and which might have gone to the teachers?—Well, seeing they are independent of the Treasury and independent of Parliament—

21560. Are they independent of the Treasury? I think we have a great deal of evidence to show they are absolutely dependent on the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN.—They say in all their reports they are dependent on the Treasury.

21561. Mr. HARRISON.—And that they are constantly trying to get more out of the Treasury with, as the Resident Commissioner told us, very partial success?—In recent years—

21562. Are you seriously making that as a charge: that in the year 1900 they deliberately gave back £50,000 to the Treasury, that they might have kept?—I will put it in this way. We were told that not a single teacher would suffer a penny from the introduction of the new system—

21563. Yes; but such things are generally said when a new system is introduced, but somebody does suffer?—We did not see why the Commissioners should have agreed to save £50,000 through the introduction of a new system if they wished, as they promised, to conserve the rights of the teachers, and to act in accordance with the spirit of the speeches of the Resident Commissioner. Then there is the question of standard numbers. It appears that the Commissioners fixed the standard numbers so low that even the Treasury enlarged them. This is in evidence given by Mr. Downing. I believe that from the way in which the chief inspectors are controlled and the manner in which they are controlled, the Inspectors' Reports on these matters cannot carry very much weight, seeing that they cannot express any opinion contrary to the policy of the Board. You cannot expect an independent expression of opinion from the inspectors when the inspectors know they cannot go against the policy of the Board on any particular question of policy.

21564. Mr. HARRISON.—I think that has all been very fully threshed out. There is no reason why they should not report as to how anything has worked. They are public servants, and they are bound not to criticise the policy of the Board which it is their duty to carry out. That is an everyday rule of the Civil Service of the Empire. I do not understand your point there?—It is that great stress is laid upon the opinion of the inspectors regarding various matters, while the inspectors while writing know they have no power to criticise the policy of the Board upon these particular cases.

2nd September, 1913.]

Mr. E. Mansfield examined.

[Continued.]

21545. I do not know to what you are referring. Are you referring to a rule or to a statement or to some episode?—Well, as regards results, we had a chorus of approval before 1900, and after that the very men who praised the old system came forward and condemned it, and told us that nothing was right under the old system and that everything was right under the new system. The opinion of men forced to write in that fashion, as apparently they have been forced, cannot count for very much.

21546-7. In fact, the charge you make is that the inspectors very quickly changed their minds when the

new system was introduced?—It does not amount to that; it amounts to this—that the inspectors dare not criticise the new system and dare not express their opinions freely. Mr. Downing stated that there was an anonymous document he was asked to criticise, and he was suspended for doing so.

Mr. HARRISON.—We were distinctly told that what Mr. Downing criticised was certain regulations affecting his own position, and he criticised nothing else. We have got his statement and a statement upon the other side, and we have got to decide as best we can.

FORTY-SIXTH DAY—WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 3RD, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—Sir SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman); The Most Rev. DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross; Sir HIRSH SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN COFFEY; Mr. HENRICH E. B. HARRISON, B.A.; Mr. JEREMIAH HENLY; Mr. WALTER McMURROUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.; and

Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Mr. E. Mansfield further examined.

21548. Have you prepared a list of subjects for your examination to-day?—Yes. I have got a lot of heads.

With regard to your dismissal, as I told you yesterday, one of the members of our Committee, Mr. Coffey, will examine you on that subject. We will defer that for a short time.

21549. Mr. HARRISON.—Perhaps the best way will be for me to continue to ask Mr. Mansfield questions at the point where we left off yesterday?—There is one point I would like to make clear. I could not answer yesterday positively whether the manager had any correspondence with the office regarding the fines for absence on educational deputations, I find now that he had correspondence, and here it is. I shall read it if you like.

21550. Perhaps it is so well that it should go upon the notes?—Here is the letter:—

"Co. Tipperary. Bull No. 7945. Cullen Boys' National School.
Office of National Education,
Dublin, 15th April, 1910.

Reverend Sir,

With reference to the absence of Mr. Edmund Mansfield, principal teacher, on the 10th and 11th February last, I am directed to inform you that the salary for the days in question has been withheld pending consideration of the case by the Commissioners, to whom the question of allowing payment under the circumstances stated in the quarterly return will be submitted at an early date.

The decision of the Board on the matter will be notified to you in due course.

I am, Reverend Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) P. E. LEMASS.

Secretary.

Very Reverend M. P. O'Neill, D.D., P.P.,
Lislin, Tipperary."

There is another letter dated the 28th April, 1910, giving the decision of the Board, and which is—

"Reverend Sir.—With reference to the official communication addressed to you on the 15th instant regarding the absence from duty on the 10th and 11th February last of Mr. Edmund Mansfield, principal teacher of the above-named school, I am directed to inform you that the question of allowing payment for the days specified was considered by the Commissioners at their meeting on the 15th instant.

The Commissioners have decided that, having regard to the terms of Rule 93 (i) of their Code, it is not permissible for them to allow payment to Mr. Mansfield for the 10th and 11th February last.—I am, Reverend Sir, Your obedient servant (Signed) W. S. DILWORTH, Secretary.—Very Rev. M. P. O'Neill, D.D., P.P." There is also a document from the Board which shows that my increment was dated from the 3rd April instead of from the 1st on account of those two days.

21571. That is covered by those letters?—No, the salary was stopped and at the end of three years the increment was delayed two days.

21572. That carried the delay to the increment also?—Yes. Of course, the serious portion of this was, as regards the two days' salary it is a comparatively trivial matter, but when I reached the maximum of the grade, it is clearly stated in the rules I would have to wait an additional year in order to get promotion to the next grade.

21573. That is that those two days might involve a delay of a year?—Yes, judging from what occurred to my neighbour, Mr. Leahy.

21574. Mr. HENLY.—92 is the rule bearing upon that point?—Yes.

21575. Mr. HARRISON.—On the general question of the teachers, we will continue where we left off yesterday?—I dealt rather briefly yesterday with the false returns made by the Board to Parliament, and I gave particulars taken from the Commissioners' own books. I find during the years 1903, 1904, and 1905 that the number of dismissals given in the reports for each year by the managers and Commissioners combined were—in 1903, 32; in 1904, 19; in 1905 there were 20. That is an average of 27 for the three years. The average in the return furnished to Parliament by the Commissioners at the instance of Mr. Thomas O'Donnell was over 50 for those three years, and this is commented on in their report, which proves that the Commissioners accepted these figures. In their reports of 1905-1906, in which they accept the figure I have quoted, they said that the number of dismissals in the years 1901 and 1902 averaged 21. In the three ensuing years the average was over 50. In other words, they repudiated their own return in the very same report in which they gave that return. I dealt briefly with the table on p. 17 of the Commissioners' report for 1904, where they gave the average salaries that could be attained by teachers of the different classes under the old regulations in various types of

school. In fixing my salary they calculated it at £376. Taking this return, given by the Commissioners, I calculated my salary upon the basis of their own statement given in that document. I find the salary should, on their own admission, have been fixed above £477. Mr. Wyse's explanation, when I called to see him, was that the return was wrong, and that the table on p. 17 of the 1904 report was not accurate.

21374. You gave that yesterday?—I think that is rather important, as showing that Mr. Birrell and the teachers and the public as a whole are furnished with false returns through Parliament. Dr. Beatty's letter supports that statement, and there I leave that matter. The next point is returned to give necessary returns.

21375. The CHAIRMAN.—I think we had that yesterday?—When Mr. Cole was appointed junior inspector in our circuit he lowered a big number of reports. We have it on the admission of the Commissioners themselves that he lowered 78 per cent. of the actual marks. By a resolution of the 5th February, passed at our Association, we brought that to the notice of the Commissioners, and forwarded a resolution to the National Board which was acknowledged by Mr. Dilworth. A question on the subject was sent to Mr. John Cullinan, M.P. The question was put by Mr. Cullinan on the 22nd April, 1910. Mr. Cullinan asked the Chief Secretary if he would state in how many schools in circuit 18 did the Office of National Education receive annual inspection returns since July, 1909, the number of schools in which the general work of proficiency was reduced by one step and two steps; and the number in which the marks were reduced. Mr. Birrell replied that "the Commissioners of National Education considered that it would not be in the public interest to furnish the information asked for in the question." The statements that the officials were not aware of this general lowering is therefore untrue. A similar question was asked regarding another circuit, and the information was refused on the same grounds, that it would not be in the interests of the public service to furnish it.

21376. What is the next point?—In 1900 they introduced this new and rather revolutionary scheme, and neither managers nor teachers were consulted by the National Board. In a pamphlet written by the Rev. Dr. O'Riordan, now the Rector of the Irish College in Rome, he asserts that the managers were not consulted. In our minute books there is resolution after resolution asking the Commissioners to hear our views, that is the views of our organisation, and Dr. Stakie positively refused to do so.

21377. Sir HIRSH WATKINSON.—Have you correspondence on that subject?—We have the resolutions on our books.

21378. The resolutions, of course, are one thing. I am asking about the correspondence. The fact that you passed a resolution is not in itself a matter of importance to us. What I want is the correspondence with the Board?—In our minute book there are copies of the correspondence with the Board, and I will bring up the minute book to-morrow if you want it.

21379. Mr. HARRISON.—That was in the year 1900?—Yes, I can bring the minute books.

I may say at once we have had a great deal of evidence on the question of giving notice both to managers and teachers on the subject of the proposed changes in programmes or rules, and I do not think it will be necessary to accumulate any more evidence upon that point. I think it was gone into very fully. We have had evidence that it has not been done, and evidence of the desirability of its being done, I think we have got all the information that is really necessary to come to a conclusion, and it is hardly necessary to illustrate that point any more. You can give us the teachers' views.

21380. The CHAIRMAN.—May I suggest that most of these things have been dealt with. Mr. Dale's report has been dealt with. The position of assistant teachers has been dealt with; but your next point, the question of civil rights, is new.

21381. Mr. HARRISON.—I suggest that for the moment we might leave that aside. Let us come to your next point—"Programmes are over-loaded?—The

opinion of the teachers is that there are too many subjects, and while there is a note at the beginning of the programme to the effect that this is the maximum, teachers must regard what the Inspector requires. The teacher does not feel that he will get the higher mark unless he takes the whole programme. Then with regard to our supposed rights to modify the programme, the experience of some gentlemen who tried it was not very happy. You already have some correspondence with regard to Castleknock school. Mr. James Hegarty, a Co. Dublin teacher, had a similar experience. In any case, the teachers generally believe that the Commissioners and the Inspectors would regard it as a sort of slight upon themselves in framing this programme if some National leaders were to substitute a better one.

21382. The CHAIRMAN.—Even if the teacher put it on the ground that it was more suitable to the people of his locality, and that that was his reason for modifying it?—The experience of teachers after having sent up modified programmes—very few have been sent for the reasons I have given—was that the Board usually said: "This is not full, this does not come within the programme, and that does not come within the programme," and the result would be that the teacher in despair would stick to the official programme. Very many teachers for the reasons I have given do not send up programmes. I should be very slow to send on one, even if I considered I could frame a more suitable programme for my own school.

21383. You have reference in your prints about an anonymous document regarding grouping, what is that?—I had a hurried glance over the evidence of Mr. Downing on that point, which shows that an attempt was made apparently to focus upon the teachers of the country a system of grouping which would be, to my mind, seriously detrimental to education.

21384. Mr. HARRISON.—So what particular document are you referring to?—To one given in evidence by Mr. Downing.

21385. What date?—About 1900, and to the effect that all classes in the schools should be grouped for subjects such as reading.

21386. Was that ever acted upon?—No, it was never acted on; but the chief of inspection was censured for circulating that document, which shows the position that National teachers would be in if they acted similarly.

21387. There has been repeated evidence upon that point, and I do not know that anything much came of it, considering it was 13 years ago, and was never acted on?—Well, but the spirit of the administration is the same still.

21388. Mr. KAYMAK.—Why do you call it anonymous?—Mr. Downing calls it anonymous. It had no signature.

21389. It came from the office?—Yes.

21390. The CHAIRMAN.—Dr. Stakie denied he was there at the time?—I consider that if the combined wisdom of the officials was only able to frame a document like that, they are not fit to frame a programme for the Irish schools.

21391. Mr. HARRISON.—Then we come to your note: "Constant shifting and changing." Does that refer to the programme?—Yes, it is a case of constant complaint, the changing of methods, programmes, and systems. One system of drawing, for instance, was introduced by Mr. Bevis at considerable expense to the country. The teachers attended this course. During the present year I have been at a lecture of the present organiser on drawing, and his views are diametrically opposed to those of Mr. Bevis. We are condemned now for the system that the Board forced on us eight years ago.

21392. I think there is a similar experience in England, and probably in Scotland, as to methods introduced lately, which found favour with some authorities, and not with others. It is an instance of rather rapid progress?—It is an instance of the imprudence of translating into one country a scheme that may suit another.

21393. I do not think we need argue that, because it would take up a long time, has the best method of teaching would have universal application whatever the country. Of course, there is no difference as to

8th September, 1913.]

Mr. E. MANSFIELD examined.

[Continued.]

guides England and Scotland and Ireland?—The conditions in the English towns are rather different from those in this country.

21594. These does not seem to be much difference in the drawing of a particular object?—The interests of an agricultural country like this would be different to those of a country like England.

21597. In any matter of that sort, as to which is the best method of teaching, I do not think we need argue the matter?—I merely gave that as an instance. You will find further proofs in your first volume of Evidence, pages 136 to 140.

21598. We have had the evidence about drawing, but this is as to special changes?—There is another point with regard to the more ordinary subject of grammar. Mr. Brown, my former chief inspector, came one day to my school. I was teaching parsing?—I believe in parsing myself—and he said it was simply waste of time, and I should teach analysis only. Then there is no change in the programme and no circular issued from the office; and Mr. Welby, in his first year examined the children in what I considered to be different sentences in parsing. I could multiply these instances, and I believe it is against the progress of education to have this constant shuffling and changing. There can be no stability or continuity about such a system.

21599. We come to your next point: "Teachers in ignorance of conditions under which they work." Is not that point well covered by your evidence yesterday?—My point in connection with that is this. That I, as a representative teacher, in constant correspondence with numbers of teachers here, there, and everywhere, have far more opportunities than the ordinary teacher of inserting the conditions for increment and promotion. And I was in absolute ignorance of them till this Committee was appointed.

21600. We had a large amount of evidence about that from the teachers and from the office, and there is no question whatever but that the system is a very complicated one?—The system is easier to the teachers I think, and it is against education that the teachers should be working in absolute ignorance of these conditions.

21601. Having got that upon the notes, I do not think we need elaborate it further, and can go on to the next point?—I come now to the delays by the Education Office in sending out reports, and I give as an instance a report which was delayed from the 16th of June to the following May.

21602. Was there any explanation?—Not so far as I know, and the next examination was held by Mr. Fergusson, exactly a week later, that is on the 7th May.

21603. Did you try to find out whether there was any cause for that delay?—I have had a letter from the teacher to the effect that the return, so far as he was concerned, was not delayed.

21604. May the manager have been responsible?—No, the manager could not have been responsible, because for besides having a copy sent to the manager, one is now sent to the teacher.

21605. But may the manager not have been responsible through some fault of his own?—How could he?

21606. You give us the case of a report delayed for eleven months, and so far as you know, without any explanation?—Yes, and I give my own reports, and the average delays for nine years would be 49 days.

21607. That statement is quite sufficient. Now, with regard to increments delayed?—In many cases they have been delayed more than a year.

21608. Do you mean where there was no question of the teacher getting the increment?—The teacher of — school deserved it in the ordinary way, by the average of his school and reports. The increment did not come. Dr. Starbuck visited this particular school and the teacher mentioned it to him. Mr. Wye took a note of it, and the teacher then got his increment. There is the case of a Cappawhitte Boys' School. Here there was a highly successful teacher under the old system, Mr. Hayes, and although he had three successive "goods" his increment did not come though the teacher wrote in connection with it. I believe the system is wrong in which increments can only

be got in that way. I wrote about this case to Mr. Ward, and he brought it under the notice of the Commissioners, and the increment was given after about four years, indeed it was more than four years when £30 arrears of salary were given. There was no question of the increment being due. I will give you another instance of injustice. It is that of a teacher, Mr. —, of a school near Newark, Co. Cork. He was trained with me, passed the same examination, got special distinction, and was entitled to what I was entitled under the old system. I told you yesterday how, by 21 months' correspondence, I got partial justice from the Board, and he brought my case and others under the notice of the Board, with the result that about £77 arrears of salary were paid. There is a similar case of a lady where they paid arrears of over £100. All came through pressure.

21609. These were all cases arising out of the transition?—No. Mr. Hayes's case is a case of ordinary increment due, and another, that of Mr. Buckley, is a similar case. I have here a number of other cases.

21610. You give these as instances of increments that had not been refused, but that were not paid in the ordinary official course?—It is quite clear Mr. Hayes never would have got his increment except for pressure, which I consider wrong, because the increments should come as a matter of course. Of course, there was nothing except about the pressure.

21611. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Was there any explanation from the Board?—No explanation. We had the case put before the Board by Mr. Ward. I know Mr. Ward, and a number of teachers knew him; but many do not, and in any case the fact that one is friendly with one of the Commissioners is not the right way to get justice. It should come as a matter of course or not at all.

21612. Mr. HARRISON.—Now we come to the question of the multiplication of small schools?—Just a word upon that point. Up to the years 1901 and 1902, almost up to the eve of Mr. Dale's visit, the Commissioners, in their reports, were taking credit for the number of schools they added to their list. They themselves were responsible for the multiplication of schools. After Mr. Dale's visit, and when he referred to the fact that the Irish schools were too numerous, and that they could be reduced by 2,000, the Commissioners immediately fell in with his idea, and started the amalgamation of schools through the Rule 127 (b), which forced the managers to amalgamate the schools, and the teachers, who were not responsible for the multiplication of schools, suffered under this Rule 127 (b).

21613. They suffered from the closing of small schools?—The managers, naturally, refused to amalgamate schools. 127 (b) was introduced with the object of reducing the numbers in the boys' schools to such a point that amalgamation would be forced upon the managers. I can give evidence of that.

21614. That was one way in which the reduction was brought about?—Yes.

21615. And that, of course, left a certain number of teachers without places? That is the point, is it not?—I would not go to that extent. Modifications were made, but teachers were still penalised.

21616. Mr. CONVEY.—Were there hardships?—In many cases where amalgamation did occur, of course, one of the teachers was depressed to the rank of assistant. There was a lowering of status there. 127 (b), which reduced the number of boys in the boys' schools, tended in the direction of amalgamation, because when the average in one of the schools went below a certain point, that is, below 25, the manager was forced to amalgamate, and, in that process, the principal teacher loses in capitulation and in many cases he suffered also from not having the average necessary for promotion. One teacher of a boys' school handed me this letter from the Board in which they reduce the salary by half through Rule 127 (b), and here is another letter in which an assistant of 30 years' experience was to have his salary withdrawn if the average was not up to 35. The Commissioners were responsible for the multiplication of schools, and in the amalgamation of schools, for which the teachers were not responsible, they were penalised seriously.

21627. That reform or change could not be carried out without a certain amount of hardship to individual teachers?—I say it could be carried out without hardship, but it was not carried out without hardship.

21628. Now, with regard to your statement, "Blanching regarding the training of teachers," what do you wish to say?—On that point, there was about 1902 a shortage of teachers on the other side of the Channel, and a great number of Irish teachers went across and got places, and in other years since you had a surplus of teachers beyond, and a large number of men could not secure places here in Ireland. They increased the number of men in the training colleges. In Waterford Training College it was increased considerably, I think by 50.

21629. Mr. HENRY.—Does not Waterford train over 200?—250. Now, the result was you had large numbers of men trained at the expense of the Irish Education Vote going about here in Ireland without places. Some of them went to Canada, and some to England, because they could not find places in Ireland. While that was going on untrained teachers actually in the service could not get increments or promotions. Such teachers applying year after year were not admitted to the colleges. I calculated that for a number of years only 51 per cent. of the teachers in the service who applied were admitted to the training colleges.

21630. Mr. HARRISON.—Were not some of them rejected because they were not of sufficient educational status?—Well, since they were of sufficient educational status to be teachers, would it not be better to train those teachers than to train students who could not find places in Ireland?

It is very difficult, of course, to keep supply and demand exactly equal.

Mr. HENRY.—These people were eligible. It was the colleges that refused to admit them.

The CHAIRMAN.—Have they an entrance examination?

Mr. HENRY.—Not necessarily.

The CHAIRMAN.—On what ground did they keep them out?

Mr. HENRY.—On the ground that they were not able to pass the final examination.

Mr. HARRISON.—That they were not sufficiently educated to pass.

The CHAIRMAN.—Does not that involve a test? How did they find that out?

Mr. HENRY.—By experience. They take some in for a course of training, and they find at the end of the year that they were not as successful in passing the examination as those in other years.

The CHAIRMAN.—Consequently, they excluded them?

Mr. HENRY.—Yes; we admit them for two years, and later the Commissioners made regulations reserving for these teachers a number of places.

21631. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—There was another difficulty also; that untrained men and women teachers could be employed, and the effect was that a number of these young men and women, who failed to get into the training colleges on the ordinary examinations, were appointed assistant teachers, and then, because they were assistant teachers, they expected to get into the training colleges, and some did?—I should say it is a misuse of public funds to train men for teachers who could not get places as teachers.

21632. Would not the real solution be to make it impossible to have untrained teachers appointed, and thus you would have an open market for trained teachers?—It is the proper solution. But there are untrained teachers in the service.

And make all teachers enter straight through the front door of the entrance examination, and not bring any in through a sort of back door?—

The CHAIRMAN.—The Board have announced that that is their policy in the future.

Mr. HARRISON.—You want to make the point that the Board failed at any rate in their calculation as to the law of supply and demand.

21633. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—I do not think he would say that. Would you say the number of teachers created was greater than the demand?—I am coming to that. From 1900 to 1910, the number of teachers trained was 2,168. The number of trained

teachers left unemployed in these years was 490, and the number of untrained teachers employed was 701. There was an annual average of about 100 students, who had been trained and fully qualified but could not find places in the Irish schools, while the untrained teachers filled the vacancies that those ought to have got. That is my point. There is some bungling when 100 in each year, say 400 in four years, are trained at a cost of upwards of £40,000, and these could not get places, and had to go to Canada or some other country.

21634. Was not the real point this: that there was not enough of trained teachers for several years to fill the vacancies, and the Commissioners allowed untrained teachers to be appointed. Then they made a rule that untrained men teachers could be employed, though we still have the untrained women teachers employed. If you take the whole number between 1900 and 1913, that is the number of trained teachers and vacancies, would the number of trained teachers be equal to the number of vacancies?—No, but why were untrained teachers sanctioned, while trained teachers were left unemployed?

21635. Would you defend the process I described to you; a young man who has passed the King's Scholarship Examination, fails to get admittance to a training college, and is afterwards appointed an assistant teacher; then through being an assistant he secures admission to a training college and comes out a trained teacher?—He has his position in the school and remains in the service trained or untrained.

21636. But how did he get it?—Through the King's Scholarship examination.

21637. He is not as good as a man who got in through competition?—In many cases, through family and other circumstances, members of them take up positions as assistants, and do not enter the training colleges. It does not follow that the best men always enter the training colleges, and it would be unfair to keep those teachers out always from training, for a number who may never teach in Ireland.

21638. The CHAIRMAN.—Is not all this settled by the policy of the Board now?—We have evidence that there will be an end put to it.

Mr. HARRISON.—It does not in the least bear upon the point. Your solution is, to leave the untrained teachers at present in the service untrained.

Mr. HENRY.—I think what really was at the bottom of it was this: For a long time Catholics were not allowed to go to the training colleges. They were called by Archbishop Walsh "the heroes of the conflict," because they stood out in support of the policy of the Roman Catholic Bishops, and when the new colleges were established to satisfy the requirements of the Bishops, the heads of the colleges refused to admit the "heroes" into the colleges, and they have remained out, and owing to the regulations, some of them have been refused promotion to the higher class, because they are technically untrained through no fault of their own.

The BISHOP OF ROSS.—And, furthermore, they were excluded from the colleges, because the colleges found the majority of them could not pass the examination.

21639. Mr. HARRISON.—It has no great bearing upon the issues of this inquiry; it is out of date now. Let us get on to the next point, "Correspondence with the Board"?—The practice of the Board is not to admit any correspondence unless it is vouched by the manager.

21640. We know that?—I have cases where the teachers sent on small matters, and these were refused because the communications were not signed by the managers, and while that is going on inspectors have held investigations on anonymous charges. Charges that have been sent up to the Board anonymously against the teachers have been investigated by the Board.

21641. Mr. KATANAUGH.—Which have not come through the managers?—Of course not! Anonymous charges by outsiders.

21642. Mr. HARRISON.—Are you going to give cases?—The most recent case is the case of Mr. FLEMING, Curragh N. S., Balhinch, Co. Roscommon. I forget the school circuit, but I will give the facts of the case.

21633. You are quite certain that an investigation was made as the result of an anonymous communication to the Board?—Not merely that the inspector went down, but made enquiries as regards the teacher in shops in the village in which the teacher lived.

21634. The point is that his investigation was as a result of an anonymous correspondence only?—Certainly.

21635. Mr. KAVANAGH.—How do you know it was anonymous?—I had it from the teacher.

21636. Mr. HARRISON.—Did your Association make any protest to the Board about it?—Not in particular cases. We have been protesting in pamphlets, speeches and resolutions against these things since I entered the organisation, and long before. Teachers are ignored by the Board so far as correspondence is concerned. Charges made by outsiders, even unsigned, are investigated. My belief is that the whole spirit of the administration must be changed. Good programmes won't do; circulars won't do; fine speeches in different parts of Ireland expressing delightful views of education won't do. We believe the attitude adopted by the office towards the teachers, who are the workers upon whom education must depend, must be changed. It is an attitude of exasperation and proscription, and it must be altered. I believe the recommendations of your Commission will be futile unless this spirit is changed.

21637. That finishes everything under the head of administration, does it not?—Yes.

21638. You have a good deal to say about the inspection system. Do you wish to enlarge upon that?—Of course, I have not prepared in writing a general statement upon the question.

21639. The CHAIRMAN.—I think, Mr. Mansfield, I should inform you that on everyone of these points on inspection in your press we have had most explicit evidence. If there is any point on which you wish to enlarge please do so. It appears to me these points are put very clearly and succinctly, but if it occurs to you that any point requires explanation, give that explanation. I might suggest that two or three questions might be asked on the points on inspection as they arise?—My first point on inspection is that no person who has not practical experience in teaching and who has not got a training or teaching diploma should be appointed inspector. The inspectorate should in the main be given to National teachers.

21640. Mr. HARRISON.—We had most decided evidence from the Resident Commissioner upon that very point?—Selection should be by competition, and in the programme the practice and theory of teaching, and actual inspection work should play an important part. Service marks should be awarded.

21641. The BISHOP or ROSS.—How would you propose that a candidate should have experience of actual inspection before his appointment. I can see very well how he could have experience in teaching, because if you limit it to teachers, they will have experience in teaching but not in inspection?—They could have it in this way: it could form portion of the examination.

21642. Before appointments the candidates should be made to inspect a number of schools under the supervision of others?—Yes.

21643. I suppose you would have him to inspect a dozen schools or so?—Of course, that is a detail.

21644. But details become very important, because we are fighting about details and small matters?—I came merely to deal with broad principles. I would have a candidate inspect a reasonable number of schools—half-a-dozen or more—and service marks should be awarded in case of National teachers appointed. No inspector who is inclined to exasperate teachers and managers should be promoted to the higher ranks. Inspectors should show a desire to sympathise and co-operate with the teachers. More oral suggestion and discussion and less of disheartening observations would be an advantage. The observation book might be dispensed with altogether. The teacher should get a copy of each report furnished to the Education Office or to the manager; that is, reports regarding his own work.

21645. Mr. HARRISON.—Doesn't he get that now?—He gets portion of the report.

21646. The CHAIRMAN.—He gets extracts?—Everything furnished to the office regarding the teacher by the inspector should be furnished to the teacher, and manager also. Of course, there may be correspondence as to buildings of which he need not get a copy, but he should get everything affecting his work.

You are implying here that the teacher does not get as much as the manager?—

The BISHOP or ROSS.—You might possibly modify your last answer, because remember what you say will be looked upon from the point of view of other services in the country?

21647. Mr. CORRY.—To get a copy of everything the inspector reports about would, I am afraid, be a large order?—The inspector should not report on the teacher or his work if the teacher has not an opportunity of reviewing his statement.

21648. He would get an opportunity of reviewing a statement of an adverse nature because it would be sent to him, or at least it should be sent to him?—Our belief is that the Board have acted on reports without giving the teacher an opportunity of knowing what the reports are. It happened in Tipperary.

21649. The BISHOP or ROSS.—What you said was rather different. You require to get down a copy of every word written up to the office. That is a very wide statement?—Why should the Commissioners get certain statements upon which they form their opinions of teachers without giving the teachers an opportunity of knowing what those statements are.

21650. Mr. CORRY.—I think there are lots of things in our official life, in our Boards, and in other people's lives also that we don't hear all about?—Well, that leads up to another point. In that line back, for the first time, we see a statement of Mr. Weply regarding the teachers of the circuit to which I belong, which was acted upon, and we never got an opportunity of meeting the various misstatements in that document. It is unfair for the Board to act without giving the teachers an opportunity of refuting the misstatements made about them. The Belfast teachers heard something about statements made against them. We did not hear what the charges were that were made against us in Circuit 13. I was asked by outsiders, for instance, how much I was fined for falsification of accounts—a thing that never occurred. The document was a gross libel on Circuit 13.

The CHAIRMAN.—There is no identification of these schools.

21651. The BISHOP or ROSS.—Would you desire that the names of the teachers who were fined should be published?—I have no desire that they should be published, but I am not against it. We dealt with that yesterday.

21652. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—The report was misleading by referring to three schools as A, B, C, and D, and then referring to other schools as A, B, C, and D?—They were, out of ten, only four members of our Organisation concerned, and I'll give the names if necessary.

21653. The CHAIRMAN.—We must not go back?—I do not wish to do so in any way.

21654. Now come to your next point?—We have no objection to surprise visits. Of course, the Board is within its rights to send the inspectors at certain times, but not outside the hours mentioned in the time-table. I gave an instance yesterday, and I have letters here bearing on the point, which I will hand in, from teachers in neighbouring schools and from pupils of the schools who were actually present at inspectors' visits before and after school hours. Shall I read them?

Mr. HARRISON.—That relates to what Mr. Mansfield mentioned yesterday.

21655. The CHAIRMAN.—We need not go back upon that?—They might trust teachers a little more, and teachers will trust them more. A man is, of course, inclined to treat another in the same manner as he is dealt with. Distrust breeds distrust. We believe that for the annual or general inspection a year or thereabouts should be allowed. I gave evidence yesterday of my own experience, and I am sure you will have evidence of others that inspectors have examined in the whole year's course and went outside it, in the first few months of the year.

21656. And you want notice?—Yes, for the annual inspection; not, of course, for the surprise visits.

21657. I see you would like to have a combination of examination with inspection, but I presume in no case would you wish to record the results of individual children?—No, but class examination of the principal subjects, and in that examination, of course, the teacher might enter.

21658. And, further, you would like to have the power either to withdraw children who are either abnormally dull or very irregular?—Yes. In preparation for the annual or general inspection a year or twoabouts should be allowed. A fortnight's notice at least should be given to both manager and teacher. Though inspection only might suffice under ideal conditions, we believe that under the present regime—considering the qualifications of inspectors, etc.—a reasonable amount of examination combined with inspection is necessary. The examination should be a class examination and might be confined to the principal subjects. Dull and irregular children should not be examined. Portion of the examination might be done by the teacher. We believe merit marks should be done away with.

21659. Mr. HANFIELD.—You don't believe there is any uniformity in that system?—We don't.

21660. You don't want to enlarge upon that?—No.

21661. You read the evidence already put before us?—Yes. Adverse circumstances—unfavourable local conditions, epidemics, unsuitable building, inadequate equipment, inspection soon after vacation, irregular attendance, etc., should be taken into account. The teacher should not be penalised for circumstances over which he has no control. One teacher should not be punished because of the work of another or others as under present regulations.

21662. You are referring to a teacher having an incompetent assistant?—Yes, or an assistant having an incompetent principal.

21663. Mr. HENRY.—Would not that be met by debarking the merit marks?—Yes.

Mr. HANFIELD.—Very largely, no doubt. Now as to your next point. You want to revert to the old system of head and district inspectors. Will you explain what you mean by "head" and "district." Are head inspectors the same as divisional?—

Mr. HENRY.—They were.

21664. Mr. HANFIELD.—That is to say you don't like the present district system?—No. We prefer a smaller number of head inspectors and to place all other inspectors on a level, as in the old days.

21665. Mr. HENRY.—And to be responsible for their district?—Yes, and the head inspector to be responsible for his division of ten districts. Then in the office, in place of having examiners who have not practical experience of inspection to deal with these reports, some men having experience, such as inspectors or chiefs of inspection, should have control of the reports. It would be well, of course, that those should not get altogether out of touch with the schools, and by increasing the number to three it could be managed. Two could be in the office, and one doing inspection work throughout the country, taken out in turn.

The CHAIRMAN.—You want to restore, in fact, the system of the old chiefs of inspection?—

21666. Mr. HANFIELD.—Now, with regard to appeals to the Board, what have you to say?—Well, at present the teachers have no faith in appeals; in fact, the majority of the teachers believe appeals but lead to further injustice. The statement of Mr. Purser would prove that the teachers are justified in having no faith in appeals. There is the letter of Mr. Purser, dated 6th April, 1912.

21667. Has that been before us?—It has.

21668. Sir HERMAN WALKERSON.—Was that after Mr. Purser had retired, or is it an official letter?—It was after he retired.

21669. I don't think we should have any more of it now!—

The CHAIRMAN.—What is it produced for?—

Mr. HANFIELD.—To show that appeals don't reach the Board.

Mr. KAVANAGH.—That, I think, is admitted by the officials themselves.

Sir HERMAN WALKERSON.—It is a letter by a former officer, which is not on the same footing at all as a letter from an officer for the time being. It is really admitting further evidence from Mr. Purser.

Witness.—I should like to give an extract from this letter. I myself had sent this letter of Mr. Purser before I made those remarks at Clonsilla for which I was dismissed. I knew at the time from the letter of Mr. Purser that appeals did not reach the Board, and that we could not have any confidence in them. It is the opinion of a chief of inspection of long experience, and, of course, if I was not to go by his experience I would have nothing to guide me. The following is an extract taken from a letter written on 6th April, 1912, by Mr. Purser to Mr. Doyle, Vice-President of I.N.T.O. It was seen by me at the Kilkenny Congress, three months before I made, at Clonsilla, on July 19th, the speech that led to my dismissal:—"... But I do not see why the President should not make a reference to it (the Clonsilla case) without mentioning names. To my mind the greatest grievance the teachers have is that there should be no means of appealing against a master of the sort, and that the Resident Commissioner, or any higher official should be allowed to intercept and stop an appeal addressed to the Board. I, as the highest official, gave my opinion that Mr. Kelly had been unfairly reported on, and was unable to have the report cancelled or my opinion of the matter laid before the Board."

21670. The CHAIRMAN.—That is the extract you want to put in?—There is another extract from a letter to Mr. George O'Callaghan, ex-President of the Irish National Teachers' Organisation, dated 22nd October, 1912, which is—"That the teachers have no means of making an effective appeal in case of an unjust report is perfectly clear and patent after my experience in the Clonsilla case. But I think that you write imprudently when you speak of 'smashing' the Board, and that your Organisation is attacking the wrong party. It is not the Board that is unwilling to do justice to the teachers, but Dr. Starke, who suppresses facts and reports and thus prevents the Board coming to a proper or any decision." Of course, our experience in the Tipperary circuit would go to justify our want of confidence in the Board. Teachers whose schools were reduced by two steps appealed to the Board and the Board would not grant the appeals.

21671. Mr. HANFIELD.—We have had the fullest evidence upon that point!—Until the reform of present Board, teachers cannot have confidence in appeals. Something, however (personally I have little faith in it), might be done by reverting to a modification of the arrangement in the 'results' days. The Board's Minute of 1903, increasing the power of the Resident Commissioner, practically takes away the power from the Board as a whole and places it in the hands of Dr. Starke. Now, in Belfast as late as 1911 there was an admirable address delivered by Dr. Starke, but there is an old Irish proverb which exactly describes the position, namely, that "his preaching and his practice were seven acres asunder." Nobody could find fault with his address; it was indeed an admirable address. His practice was the reverse.

21672. The CHAIRMAN.—I have heard of it!—Mr. Hynes singles out for special praise Mr. Welby or Mr. MacMillan. He calls them efficient men, but men who we consider are inclined to exasperate the teachers and give us trouble in every way they can. Mr. MacMillan is regarded in the north as an inspector inclined to give little help to the teachers.

21673. Is he still there?—Yes; and Mr. Welby in the south is regarded by Dr. Starke as a most efficient officer. I gave facts yesterday to prove that the office and Dr. Starke have a very high opinion of him.

21674. Mr. HANFIELD.—I think you told us enough about Mr. Welby. You want to say something about the Secretaries?—At least one of the Secretaries should have practical experience as teacher or inspector, or preferably as both.

Now we come to the question of salaries in your notes!—

The CHAIRMAN.—Does that come within our terms of reference? I don't think we have anything to do with finance at all or to make any recommendations about salaries.

Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Perhaps I might suggest we do not object to Mr. Manfield simply saying what he has to say on that question.

The CHAIRMAN.—I think it my duty to point out it is outside our terms of reference.

Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—He can say what he thinks without anybody examining on the points.

21675. The CHAIRMAN.—Very well. Will you say what you wish to say about the salaries of Irish National teachers, though, as I say, it is very doubtful whether it comes within our terms, but in order to get it on the notes you may read your statement—I bring the subject in here because salaries have been referred to. The salaries of teachers are much too low in proportion to the importance of their work. They are 40 to 50 per cent. lower on the average than those of the teachers of Britain. The salary scheme is defective—the higher incomes being for the majority untenable, and under the most favourable circumstances cannot be reached in less than 35 years. Dr. Sturges's premises in Belfast in 1902 regarding special treatment and promotion of teachers from third to first grade were not carried out. Teachers entitled to promotion to second or first or first of first cannot get it. The incremental movement leads to friction and discontent. It should be annual. There are delays in awarding increments and promotion, and provision is necessary to secure either. Increment increase has not kept pace with the cost of living. Standard numbers should be abolished. The average necessary for promotion to the higher grades should be abolished.

21676. The average of numbers?—Yes, the average attendance. A decent initial salary with annual and automatic increments should be given. Only gross neglect should stop increment. If the grades or classes of teachers be continued, promotion should depend partly on scholarship and partly on service. It would be well to have some system devised by which teachers of superior qualifications and long and efficient service could be promoted from the smaller to the larger schools. Assistant teachers should not be, as they are practically, confined to the lower grade of salary, and some means should be devised by which in the selection of principals their services as assistants should count. Salaries should be paid monthly. The present system is unfair, and leads to financial loss and the absence of thrift.

21677. The BISHOP OF ROSK.—Can you suggest a method of removing the difficulty without increasing the cost?—No, my lord; but the cost is so small in comparison with the great advantage it would be to the average teacher, that it is a matter that should be considered. The cost would be merely the increased clerical expenditure in the office. The office put the extra expenditure at £5,800. That has been questioned by Mr. Birrell, and I believe with reason, but we believe that the teachers, through the present system of payment, besides leading to a want of thrift, must in the aggregate lose £260,000 a year.

21678. How does that occur?—Merely through the credit system.

21679. Do you mean a large number of teachers have to go into debt?—Yes.

21680. And that they are charged interest on their accounts?—That there is an extra charge on account of the credit system.

21681. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you any clear cases of teachers getting credit for, and who are embarrassed by debt? Is it a frequent occurrence, I mean?—Well, most teachers get into debt every quarter.

21682. What we question is whether a large number of teachers who do not get their salaries monthly are bound to go into debt and pay these large prices. Are there a large number of teachers in that position?—There are.

21683. The BISHOP OF ROSK.—Are there not a large number of teachers who have banking accounts behind them?—Very few. My experience is that the teachers are living up to what they get, and it is not easy for

many of them to live upon it. Where the average salary of a teacher is £65, and where a man has to support a family, he cannot have much of a banking account. I do not know a single teacher who has a banking account; I could not name one.

I could name several.

21684. The CHAIRMAN.—Do you find that the rise in prices affects you in your districts?—Of course. In the Board of Trade Returns recently published you have an average increase in cost of about 12 per cent. all round since 1905. Now, it is a very peculiar thing that if you take the cost of living in London, putting 100 as the index number, the average in 81 towns in Britain would be 89.5—that is the cost of food, clothing, coal, rent. For the Irish towns given in that return, the average is 90.5. In other words, the cost is higher in the Irish towns than in the towns in Britain.

The CHAIRMAN.—That return appeared in the paper.

21685. The BISHOP OF ROSK.—It also appears that the cost of living, as compared with 50 years ago, has gone down, and 80 years ago the teachers had small salaries?—They mostly existed. But the cost of living was enormous then, it fell later, but it is gradually rising again, and it has nearly gone up to what it was in the early eighties.

21686. The CHAIRMAN.—All this is really outside our province, and the last time spent upon it the better?—All I want to say is that the increase in the cost of living since 1895 is 25 per cent., and since 1905 the increase would be about 11 or 12 per cent. Reference has been made already to the fact that we got more than £134,000, called the Birrell grant, in 1909; but taking that grant into account, it would not in any way counterbalance the increase in the cost of living since 1905. Do you wish me to compare the salaries of the English, Irish and Scotch teachers?

The CHAIRMAN.—No. We have had that in various reports before us.

21687. Mr. HARRISON.—It is better to have the proposals you make generally put on the notes as cordially as possible—I have dealt with the transition teachers, and also with the distinctions made between teachers of the same standing, and with partial increments. I do not know whether the Education grant comes within the terms of reference.

21688. The CHAIRMAN.—We have no power to deal with that?—They have been mentioned here.

The CHAIRMAN.—A lot of things have been mentioned which are not within our terms. You have compared your grant in Ireland with the Scottish grant already.

21689. Mr. HARRISON.—Take the next head in your notes, "The Training of Teachers"?—I should be prepared to deal with the question of grants if you wish it.

The CHAIRMAN.—We could not make a recommendation on the subject. Have you any documents comparing the grants that you could hand in.

21690. The BISHOP OF ROSK.—I would object to that, unless I got an opportunity of cross-examining on the grants, because I do not admit that the comparison is accurate, as between the Scottish and the Irish grant. It was in every direction from my point of view?—It was taken from the actual returns.

21691. Perhaps it is the actual estimate, but there are things omitted and included which change the whole face of the document?—I stand by the document. Nothing is omitted.

And I stand by my opinion against the document.

The CHAIRMAN.—I am afraid I must rule that we cannot delay at this and must proceed to the next head.

21692. Mr. HARRISON.—What have you to say as to the training of teachers?—We believe that there has been a considerable deterioration in the qualifications of the candidates entering Training Colleges, and that there has been a bigger number of failures at the end of the course than in the early days of this new system.

21693. The BISHOP OF ROSK.—At the end of their course?—They are taken on a much lower percentage into the Training Colleges. About 1900 they were refusing candidates who made 70 per cent. I have one instance of a teacher making 71.6 per cent., and he was not admitted to training. At present they are admitting candidates making 49.5 per cent. or less.

21594. In the Training Colleges all round?—The qualifications of candidates entering the Training Colleges all round have gone down since 1900.

21595. Notwithstanding that the competition has gone up?—I don't admit that the competition has gone up.

21596. Mr. KAVANAGH—What is the cause?—The cause, to my mind, would be that the prospects of the teachers, under the new system, are not so bright. There is the further fact that owing to the number of dismissals of teachers after the introduction of this new system, and the fact that people are becoming disgusted with the harassing regulations of the Board, a number of young men and women, who would have entered the service under normal conditions, do not enter it now and go to other callings. The treatment of the Board, apart altogether from the question of salaries, has, I believe, a deterrent effect upon candidates. I believe that the training should be in connection with the Universities, and that the course should be extended to three years.

21597. Would that recommendation of the extension to three years apply to every student?—To the best of the students. Of course, something is being done in that direction already. Before the Universities Act of 1908 was passed, it was generally stated by those identified with the agitation for the new University, that one of the main functions of the University should be the training of Primary and Secondary teachers. Since the Act was passed we have heard little about the training of teachers in connection with the Universities. If the Universities are to affect the country as a whole, we believe it can be best done through the training of the teachers. Under the present conditions a very small proportion of the people benefit by the Universities. If the teachers had that advantage the influence of the Universities would reach the mass of the people indirectly.

21598. The Chairman.—Have they a Chair of Education in the National University?—Yes, Professor Goreau—

21599. There is one going to be established in Belfast; they haven't the money yet?—I could quote a great many authorities, including Dr. O'Dwyer, Bishop of Limerick, in support of the view I have put forward.

21600. The Bishop of Ross.—I must ask one question about the number of teachers in training. I have before me the last Report for 1910-11, and in the Appendix I find that in the year 1910, 754 men were candidates for examination for training, and of these 531 passed. Now, all the Training Colleges together, as far as I know, hold only 545 men candidates?—Yes, but the number coming out would be 600.

21601. Do you mean of men?—Oh, no.

21602. The average would be 600, but men and women. Out of 754 men candidates, 531 passed?—Have you the figures for this year?

21603. No, this is the last Report. Twice as many passed as there was room for, and nearly one-third failed. Now, the number of women candidates was 2,141, and the number that passed was 1,266, and the total number of yearly entrants to the Training Colleges is 322. There were 1,266 qualified candidates for 531 places; was not that tremendous competition?—In what year?

21604. In the year 1910?—Oh, yes. There were numerous competitors and several passes, but poor material.

21605. Further, we find that out of 1,266 qualified candidates, 531 passed into the First Division; so that even of those who passed into the First Division, not much more than half could enter. This Return also gives 1911; and there is a note added that in 1911 the percentage of marks to qualify for this division was raised as against 1910. Now, the result was that in 1911 you had only 492 men qualified, as against 531 the year before, and the number of women was 1,225, as against 1,266, but still there qualified nearly twice as many men, and four times as many women as could be admitted?—From the Returns this year you will find that the total number of men candidates who passed are not sufficient to fill the places for the colleges.

21606. That change occurred within two years, between 1911 and 1912?—Well, going back still further

to 1904, Father Byrne, the Principal of Drumcondra College, said—

21607. I know that the whole thing changed since then—I think it is only fair that this should go on the Minutes.

21608. I think it is quite fair that the present year 1913 should go on the Minutes, but I do not see that we can go back to 1904, and seeing that the numbers were small then, and that they increased enormously in 1910 and 1911, won't that destroy your argument, instead of serving it?—We have it stated in evidence that Drumcondra Training College was never without a sufficient supply of candidates, but we have Father Byrne, Principal of Drumcondra Training College, giving the opposite view, and I think it should be given.

21609. Very well, I have no objection?—Father Byrne stated—“It would appear from these figures that the number of candidates is fluctuating, and that the tendency on the whole is steadily downward.”

21610. The accuracy of that prophecy is proved by the figures for 1910-11?—And 1912. And he continues—“The question suggests itself whether the downward tendency it continued may reach a point that would mean serious consequences for our College. Let us take this year 1904-5. The number of vacancies to be filled was 112. The total number of candidates that year was 149, but of these 10 failed at the Easter examination; 12 did not present themselves for examination, and 15 withdrew their applications. Thus left only 112 candidates for 112 vacancies, which meant we were not in a position freely to reject men who, in the opinion of the members of the staff, might be considered unsuitable candidates for the position of teaching. Without a good margin for selecting candidates for the two years' course, it must happen that undesirable candidates will be accepted, and this means sending out later from the Training Colleges undesirable men as teachers.” This year, at the first examination of the King's scholars, I understand, there was a far bigger proportion of failures than occurred in any year during the existence of the colleges; one-fifth of all failed.

21611. Because we are told by the inspectors that the standard has been raised both for entrance and for exit, which, I suppose, accounts for the failures?—Judging by the papers of the Easter examination, there certainly has not been a rise in the standard of the examination test given.

Mr. HENRY.—That only applies to the First and Second Division, and not to the Third.

21612. Mr. MANFIELD.—You say too many men are trained?—I have given the figures which prove that. I want also to speak about the junior assistant mistresses, and the training of unmarried teachers in the service is of importance. There should be another language in addition to English on the Scholarship programme.

21613. That is your recommendation?—I believe that would be an advantage, and that fees for Latin and French should be paid, so as to give the candidates in schools that don't take up Irish an opportunity to qualify for training.

Mr. HENRY.—If that recommendation were carried how would it affect the Training Colleges?

The CHAIRMAN.—You would not get boys to come in.

Mr. HENRY.—No. They are not taught a language.

The CHAIRMAN.—They would not have the means of learning it.

21614. The Bishop of Ross.—You are aware, Mr. Manfield, that the number of children learning Irish has been decreasing rapidly in latter years?—I don't think that the number learning Irish has been decreasing, but the numbers presented for fees have been decreasing.

21615. The grant has fallen. I think it was £18,000 some years ago; it is only £10,000 in the estimates this year?—My experience of the teaching of Irish and extras would prevent any man taking them up. The clerical work alone involved in the presentation of pupils for fees would scarcely be recouped by the fees given. Numbers of teachers are teaching Irish and Mathematics, and yet, owing to these regulations, they do not present them. I believe some encouragement should be given to the teachers after being in the Training Colleges to study as in the old days.

3rd September, 1913.]

Mr. E. MASSFIELD examined.

[Continued.]

21716. Mr. HARRISON.—We know what happened there?—It is the general opinion of members of our Organisation that it would be to the advantage of education, and would tend to make the teachers more industrious.

21717. Under the next head you make a definite suggestion as to the form of study?—Something should be done in the way of Extension Lectures, as in Belfast, and I believe the National University is about to institute the same.

21718. And summer courses?—Yes. At present a number of teachers at their own expense join Irish Colleges to learn Irish. I believe the Board might do something to encourage them. For attending courses in Cookery, Laundry and Kindergarten, the expenses of the teachers are paid at present by the Board, and we do not see why that should not be extended to the case of those learning Irish in the Irish Training Colleges. The Board should give encouragement in that direction.

21719. You think that the expenses of teachers attending should be paid?—Yes. They are paid, as I say, at present for many subjects.

21720. But you would like to make that rule universal?—Yes.

21721. The CHAIRMAN.—Now we come to your comments on the various statements of the chief inspectors in the minutes of evidence?—Yes. The chief inspectors imply that dissatisfaction with the present system is confined to one or two circuits and to "agitation," and they also hint that representatives of the teachers neglect their duties.

21722. To that you give a contradiction?—Emphatically.

21723. You mention two inspectors, Mr. Welby and Mr. MacMillan; are there any other inspectors of whom you make similar complaints?—We have complaints from every county in Ireland, though not to the same extent.

21724. Not so serious?—I believe it is due to the system.

21725. Of the members of the inspectorate on the whole you would not make very serious complaints?—No, it is against the system.

21726. Not personally?—Well, we believe it is possible that what occurred with these men may occur in other districts.

21727. We had it from another witness, that as regards most of the inspectors, no serious complaint is made of their personal attitude towards the teachers?—There are a few.

21728. Some men make mistakes?—There are a few. I'll mention their names. There is a general complaint against the present system of inspection. Of course, I do not like to say hard things of Mr. Welby, a good many hard things have been said, but I think under a proper system Mr. Welby would have done better.

21729. He is a competent man?—He is an able and hard-working man, but too officious, and our idea cordially was, and I said this in the correspondence, that he was qualifying for a higher post by his severity.

21730. Mr. CARRY.—You mean for the chief inspector?—Yes, we understood he had the Resident Commissioner at his back.

21731. The CHAIRMAN.—That is a serious criticism?—The Resident Commissioner must have been aware even before we complained of the state of affairs in Tipperary. I know schools in other parts of Ireland complained of Mr. Welby.

21732. I think I am right in saying he was not aware?—I have given the resolution forwarded to the Board regarding Mr. Cole. I have read also a question put by Mr. Cullinan in Parliament and the answer, and I cannot possibly understand how the Secretaries to the Board and Dr. Starkin were unaware of the state of feeling in Tipperary.

21733. What was the date?—The first quarter of 1910, from the 5th February to the middle of April. I cannot give the exact date the resolution of the Association was in the hands of the Board. The question asked by Mr. Cullinan was on the 22nd April, 1910, and we

believe the office should have taken notice of our complaints. We merely asked for inquiry, we did not blame anybody, but asked for examination of the state of affairs. There is another point. There is a sort of implication of the representatives of the teachers neglecting their duties. If you take the teachers whose names are in the memorial from Tipperary, you will find the names of some of the best teachers in the whole country appended to that memorial, men whose qualifications are high, whose schools are good and records much above the average. Even teachers who are getting "excellent" elsewhere at present are not satisfied with the system, because they know what occurred in our circuit is possible in theirs, because next year, when a new inspector comes along, he is inclined to follow his own whim, and he would say, "I must see that these agitators are not altogether neglecting education." On questions of the grant for boarding and cleaning schools, and in connection with the grant for scholarships, and on the question of getting the Training Colleges into touch with the Universities, and generally on matters which we feel would tend to the improvement of education, we have done all we possibly could. It is our policy not to run counter to the public interest. The first plank in our programme is the improvement of education. Of course, some people think that the improvement of the teacher's salary has nothing to do with education. I need not dwell upon that point, because, after all, the quality of education depends on the teachers, and that of the teachers you get depends to a large extent on a question of salary. I have had during a number of years, while representative of the teachers, letters of complaint from teachers here, there, and everywhere in Ireland, regarding dissatisfaction with the system, and complaints of delay in increments, delays in reports, of increments unjustly held, and so on. You can have evidence on these matters from representatives of every circuit, and they are prepared to hand in statements with regard to their circuits. Altogether we got about 2,100 statements from teachers in every part of Ireland, and at least 1,300 teachers were induced to come forward and give evidence if you would hear them. A number who had grievances, and were complaining bitterly, were timid in coming forward for various reasons, and did not send in complaints.

21734. Mr. HARRISON.—The chief inspectors say that adverse circumstances are duly considered, and rather favour the teachers. You propose to give some evidence in disproof of that statement?—We gave it yesterday. There is also the document handed in by Mr. Purser, who stated that in order to get the mark "excellent" the school building should be a good one. The evidence of Mr. Mitchell regarding Castlerea also disproves it. Another point is that the school report, as a whole, is lowered because of the mark of the assistant, and it sometimes happens that where the mark of the school is good the principal will not get the advantage of that "good."

21735. You mean the principal's mark may be lowered with the mark of the school?—Yes.

21736. It is possible to conceive circumstances in which that may be justly so?—Yes, but the other is not just.

21737. That is to say, in your view, it is unjust that a man should suffer for the inefficiency of an assistant mistress, over whom, as you told us, he has practically no control?—Yes, that is why I gave the instance.

21738. You went into that pretty fully yesterday. Now let us come to the point about the time taken by a junior inspector to decide on marks?—You had evidence by Mr. McNeill that most junior inspectors of the Board could decide on the mark of a school in ten minutes.

21739. He qualified that a good deal afterwards. What he meant was that an experienced man would in a large proportion of cases be right in his inspection when he came to the school?—Yes, but Mr. Hynds, after spending an hour, was not quite satisfied about the marks to give, and I have instances here in your first volume where Mr. Welby spent four, five and six hours inspecting a school, and he was, they say, "a highly efficient inspector."

All Mr. MacNeill said was, that in the great majority of cases the first impression was the right one.

The CHAIRMAN.—I think I am right in saying that the remark about the ten minutes was practically withdrawn?

21739. Mr. HANCOCK.—All he said was that first impressions generally were right, but he said himself he would be very sorry to rest upon them?—Now, about the "Tone" circular. We believe that to be a ridiculous document. Of course, the impression a person gets on entering a school will be measured to a great extent by the appearance of the building, of the children, and the surroundings.

I may say at once we have all read the "Tone" circular.

The CHAIRMAN.—We know it by heart. A member of this Committee described it as one of the most brilliant and wrong-headed documents ever published.

21740. Mr. HANCOCK.—I think it is not necessary to enlarge upon the "Tone" chapter, unless you can throw some new light upon it?—Well, there is one portion of it which makes the District or Junior Inspector practically the echo of the senior. He cannot alter the mark. Of course, the tendency, then, is not to question the mark of the senior when the senior has given a particular mark. I rather think the junior and district inspectors would be slow in questioning a mark given by the senior, and would be inclined to avoid the correspondence that would follow from any inclination on his part to raise the mark.

21741. That is a perfectly fair point to make?—It is an attempt to enforce artificial uniformity. He has to follow the inspector up to the same standard, and show there is uniformity. The Board itself shows it does not believe in the circular in this way. The teacher is acquainted with the pupils, he knows their ability, and what each is capable of doing. For the promotion of these pupils from class to class, the Board insists that the teacher should hold an examination; yet the inspector, who may never have entered the school before, is in ten minutes to decide upon the tone of the school.

21742. I don't think you have any right to say ten minutes?—The Resident Commissioner himself decided in the majority of the schools in Tipperary in twenty and twenty-five minutes.

21743. Yes, but he told us his decision was not a final one, and he was not likely to make it a final one. Let us deal with your point about the lowering of marks in the third year?—The evidence of the members of our Committee, who have compiled statements and returns with regard to the various circuits, will afford proof that there was no tendency, as Mr. MacNeill asserts, to deal mercifully in the third year. The teacher knows his merit and promotion depend upon the mark in the final year. Unless in exceptional cases, it is ridiculous to suppose that that teacher will not work up to the standard of the previous years. We have had numbers of such cases from all parts, and I can hand in 30 additional statements from teachers in Tipperary upon that point.

21744. Are you prepared to hand in these returns?—I have the returns regarding the Tipperary circuit. Beside the cases of teachers who gave evidence, I have 50 returns from the Tipperary circuit alone.

21745. The BANNER or ROSS.—Are you able to state, because, if so, I think it should be stated, that the merit mark is reduced more frequently in the third year than in the second or first year?—I could not assert that positively. What evidence we have shows it is usual.

21746. Because the statement of Mr. MacNeill that you are controverting was that there was leniency towards the teachers in the third year?—We do not believe that.

21747. And the inference was that there were fewer marks reduced in the third year than in the other years. If you contended that you should be able to show that the marks were reduced more frequently in the third year?—The Education Office has a large staff at its disposal and they have all these documents. They have refused over and over again to return to Parliament. How then is it possible for me to get all these returns?

21748. Of course, then it is not possible that you could give it?—The evidence we have would go to show

that the number of marks lowered in the third year was greater than in other years.

21749. Mr. HANCOCK.—We will leave it at that?—Of course, you see our difficulty in dealing with the matter as a whole. The office refuse us the returns.

21750. Do you contradict the evidence?—I believe it would be possible, not in Mr. MacNeill's own case, because he had the reputation in the Limerick circuit of being a very conscientious man, and I believe he would have a tendency towards mercy.

21751. The CHAIRMAN.—It was said by many witnesses that the tendency of the inspectors was towards leniency?—Mr. MacNeill, I think, was giving his own experience. The opposite is general.

21752. Mr. HANCOCK.—Would not the next year then be the third year?—No, if you were going for promotion; suppose you were going for promotion say to second grade, and you got two "goods" and one "fair," there is a sort of impression that a man could make it all right next year. It is not possible as a teacher requires three successive "goods." If report falls he has to begin his three years again.

21753. The CHAIRMAN.—Dr. Sturges says in case of two "goods" and a "fair," that he himself would see that if a man gets "good" in the fourth year he will get his increment?—Leniency of that kind never came under my notice.

21754. He says it is constantly done?—I don't suppose there are half-a-dozen teachers in Ireland who believe him.

21755. Now to go on, I think you have already said a good deal about the £114,000?—There is a question here put by his Lordship the Bishop of Ross?—What effect had the £114,000 on satisfying the teachers?—that was a substantial sum. Well, the idea apparently conveyed by that question is that we should have set down quite satisfied with the £114,000 and given up all agitation. I have shown that the percentage of the cost of living exceeded the percentage that would come on to our salaries through that sum, and, so far as we are concerned, we will not be satisfied with that £114,000 while the average salary of adult Irish teachers remains at £38. You have train strikes where the train conductors are getting 31/- per week, and I say the teachers of Ireland will not be satisfied with such a salary as 31/- per week. We have higher ideas of our profession than that. Of course, it was a substantial sum.

21756. The BANNER or ROSS.—Your interpretation of the question that all agitation should be stopped is wider than the question itself. The question as to what effect it had in satisfying the teachers does not mean that they should give up agitation altogether?—The idea I took from the question was that it was almost impossible to satisfy those "agitators," after giving them £114,000.

21757. I am not at all clear that that does not interpret me. If all you agitated for is granted, would you undertake that the teachers would be satisfied?—If each claim was granted?

21758. The various claims. If these were all granted, would you give us a guarantee that the teachers would be satisfied?—I do not think we have come to the question of claims yet, and besides there is no finis in these matters. You say you have no power to grant them.

21759. Precisely, and you try to use my question as final?—On occasions I think it is quite necessary to be discontented and to preach discontent with conditions that are not satisfactory, and we will continue that.

21760. You have answered?—But within the limits of reason and justice.

21761. Mr. HANCOCK.—You said a good deal yesterday on the point about statistics and looking and observing?—Of course, that new grant of £21,600 goes some way. It is not sufficient.

21762. The CHAIRMAN.—Now we come to the question of the needs for reform?—We believe the Resident Commissioner has too much power. He has practically gathered into his own hands the reins of power, and the Board has neither responsibility nor authority for the acts done in its name. That has been shown with regard to appeal.

3rd September, 1913.]

Mr. E. MANSFIELD examined.

[Continued.]

21763. We know that to a large extent certain powers have been delegated by the Board to him?—Of course, Dr. Sturges has dealt unfavourably with me, and I do not wish to say anything very strong or very hard about him. He is an able man, but looking over the evidence, and trying to read it in a calm way, we believe he deals tyrannically with all, including the higher officials of the Board, with the chiefs of inspection and others.

21764. That is your personal opinion?—Yes, that is my personal opinion, and I believe it is not good for education to have a man with so much power in his hands at the head of affairs, and that the tendency would be to tyrannise over his officials. I believe something should be done to lessen the power of the Resident Commissioner.

21765. The CHAIRMAN.—What promotion would you give him?—Honestly, I would like him to get twice the salary he has at present; and, for the sake of education, I think it would be well he got promotion.

21766. Mr. CONNELL.—To some other sphere?—I would like to see him get a better position. It is not the man, but the administration of education in Ireland that is in my mind. Of course, there is a tendency to promotion in my mind, but I try to look at it impartially, and I should like to develop that a little.

21767. Mr. HARRISON.—I think it is hardly necessary. I think you will find it would not benefit your case much?—He has insulted the children of the schools in his examinations before the University Commission in examining Dr. O'Dwyer. There also he attacks the teachers for whose training he is responsible. He insults us for our want of qualifications. He has a sneer at another gentleman who has done a good deal for Irish education, Mr. Dillon. This will be found in the very same page of the report of the University Commission. At Belfast in 1902 he hit everyone all round. He says that nobody will listen to an Irish debate in Parliament, except when something in the nature of an entertainment is to be provided. He looks upon the Irish members as "variety artistes." Then with regard to professional men; he says they cannot be trusted to give an honest vote. With regard to managers; he says they can find money for everything but education. In his speech at Belfast he gave various extracts from various reports of inspectors and statements of inspectors for which I believe he himself was responsible. He created this friction at a time that he himself, for some reason or another, wished the inspectors to make a concerted attack upon the managers. He has had friction with everybody, from the children up to the Chief Minister. Of course, with regard to the teachers, our views don't count. He has hit us so often on this side of the Channel and the other side that certainly it is not Dr. Sturges's fault if the world has not a very low opinion of the Irish school master, while the Board and Dr. Sturges are responsible for his training. We admit the training could be improved. I am sorry it is not improved. We feel the want of a better education and training, but it is not right that the man who is responsible for that training should insult us for lack of qualifications. Personally, I would like to see some outsiders coming in to infuse a little new blood into the inspectors. I should not have it confined altogether to National teachers. I should say at least two-thirds should be National teachers, and I believe all, whether National teachers or otherwise, should have a training diploma and experience in teaching.

21768. The CHAIRMAN.—That is new. What proportion would you like to have of National teachers?—At least two-thirds. Some of my colleagues hold the view that all should be National teachers, still I think it would be well to have a provision that there should be a few outsiders. It would tend to bring in new ideas. Men working under the National Board are inclined to get into a groove, and it would be well if some from outside having experience of other systems should be appointed. It would help towards co-ordination of the various systems.

21769. That proposal would necessitate raising the initial salary, because some of your teachers stated they would refuse the position of inspectors?—The teachers that would refuse the position of inspectors are very few.

21770. I could give you one in Belfast?—Well, I think it is a very small proportion of teachers that would refuse inspectorships. In Ireland there are not 20.

21771. Mr. HARRISON.—With regard to the heading in your notes of co-ordination and secondary schools, will you develop that?—I think you have at the present time no real co-ordination between primary and secondary schools. You have a good proportion in the secondary schools, say about 18,000 on the rolls, but the best material is not in these secondary schools. There is no qualifying examination for entrance, and it is my experience and the experience of most teachers that you have boys really fitted for secondary schools who have to stop with their primary education, while others, because of the circumstances of their parents, can go to the secondary schools, though they are not fitted for secondary training. My idea is there should be an entrance examination to the secondary schools, and that State money should be paid only for those who qualify. Of course if a parent is wealthy enough to pay for a full secondary training of his children, well and good; but no State money should be paid for the education of a boy in a secondary school who does not pass the entrance examination into that school. My idea is that there would then be some money available for taking up to the secondary schools a number of boys of ability from the primary schools—of course, the proportion would not be very large—into the secondary schools.

21772. That means that you would have the system, as in England, of admitting a number of boys to places provided in the secondary schools?—Something like that. Of course, £10,000 for scholarships would go some way. They spend £150,000 on such in Scotland.

21773. You were thinking of the number of places to be provided in the secondary schools?—My idea is in the interest of the secondary schools themselves, and in justice to the country, which is spending money on education in secondary schools, that there should be an entrance examination, and that parents sufficiently well off, who may send their boys up without examination, should pay fully for them.

21774. The HONORABLE MEMBER.—Don't the secondary schools in Ireland come under the class of private schools?—While they are private they draw public funds.

21775. What proportion of their support comes from public funds, and what proportion comes from private funds?—It seems to me that you are mixing up State schools and private schools?—I believe that while the State spends £112,500 on secondary education, as in Ireland, the State should have something to say to those entering such schools, and to the education given there.

21776. They are private schools all the same?—They are private schools drawing public funds.

21777. Drawing a small public subsidy?—Drawing £112,500 a year.

21778. What proportion is that on the expenditure?—It is an average of more than £5 per head.

21779. The CHAIRMAN.—Some of them are not private schools?—I know they are paying twice as much for each boy on the rolls of secondary schools as is paid for the education of primary school boys. There is upwards of £8 per head for the children on the rolls of the secondary schools.

21780. The HONORABLE MEMBER.—You cannot draw any comparison between the amount paid for the primary school boy and the secondary school boy and the university student. Taking the university student, how much does he cost?—That is a different matter altogether.

21781. You are comparing incommensurable things?—Compare the cost in National University with the cost in Oxford.

21782. The CHAIRMAN.—If you ask the cost of an Oxford student, I should like to hear it worked out?—The point I wish to make is that where upwards of £8 per head of those on the rolls of the secondary schools is taken out of the public funds, that the people of the country should have something to say in regard to these schools, and I think it would be well for the secondary schools themselves.

Ed. September, 1918.]

Mr. E. MARSHFIELD examined.

[Continued.]

21788. The *Banner of Ross*.—It does not come within your province to tell them what is well for them?—I was invited to this Commission to express my views.

21789. Not upon the question of secondary education?—Well; but if you admit the question of co-ordination, it comes in.

21790. The *Chairman*.—We have nothing to say to co-ordination?—I believe it would tend to improve the attendance at Irish schools, and that it would be a greater incentive to study, if boys of ability—I don't say that every boy in a National school is a boy of ability—but if a reasonable number of National school boys of ability and industry had a right to go up and avail themselves of some of the State funds under the secondary system of education. In Scotland they spend £150,000 on bursaries and things of that kind, and I have been told by teachers at the Scotch Education Congress that while it was some use having a compulsory Act, the improved attendance in Scotland is due mainly to the fact that these inducements exist.

21791. The *Banner of Ross*.—What proportion of the boys in the secondary schools at present, enjoying these benefits that you describe, come from the National schools?—The proportion, according to the evidence of Mr. Delo, would vary from 10 to 50.

21792. In some schools 10, in some 50. You have a much higher proportion in some schools than 50 coming from the National schools?—It does not follow that the best material in the National schools is going to the secondary schools. That is my point, and I had experience of that last year. In my own school there was a very clever boy with brains and plenty of industry. At about fourteen years of age he had done three books of Euclid, was able to write a good composition, and had done a good portion of algebra, and was well up all round. That boy is now driving a creamery cart; another boy of his class with less ability, but whose father has more means, was able to go to the secondary school.

21793. Do you mean that no ability should be left for farm and creamery, but that all the ability should go to other pursuits?—It does not take much brains to drive an ass. One of those boys was a strong, able, strapping chap, well fitted for work, and he went to the secondary school, while the other boy, not very strong, went to manual labour.

You will find it hard to reverse the conditions of society all round.

21794. Mr. *Marshfield*.—You have dealt with the question of regularity of attendance in schools, and with the question of increments, and the suggestion that they ought to be automatic, and we have had a great deal of evidence about that. We also know the whole facts about promotion, and if I may say so, we are probably fairly well agreed upon that. We also know all about the standard numbers, and have gone very fully into that question. There is the question about civil rights, which, with your permission, I will leave for the moment. Would you like the next question in your price to go upon the notes?—Yes. Mr. Welby should be removed from circuit 18, otherwise friction will continue. Teachers who have suffered should be indemnified. With regard to the question of civil rights; I believe we should get these.

21795. Mr. *Conry*.—Mr. Hynde in that report of his on the Clonmel circuit said there was an amazing style of inspection in the circuit prior to Mr. Welby's transfer there. You have had experience of Mr. Brown, the previous inspector of the district. Had you any reason to think that Mr. Brown's style or methods of inspection were easy-going?—Not a bit of it. I believe he was a conscientious officer. Teachers liked him, because he was inclined to help teachers and to sympathise with them, and to give them encouragement. I certainly believe he would not tolerate anything in the nature of neglect of duty.

21796. The difference in the two men was that Mr. Brown was kindly and sympathetic, both to teachers and to children?—Yes, and acted, in so far as one could see, in accordance with the spirit of the instructions from the office. Under him we worked harder because more freely.

21797. With Mr. Welby's examination of your schools I am in full sympathy, but I can quite see that difficulty and hardship would arise to the teachers from a sudden change by an inspector, who was acting in the spirit of the new system, being succeeded by a man who acted in accordance with the present system, and that that was likely to give rise to trouble and the lowering of morale?—Certainly. I admitted Mr. Welby was an able man, but I think he ran counter to the spirit and instructions of the office.

21798. And while he may have acted quite fairly and justly, from his own standpoint, and from my view of education he acted in the only way a school can be tested, that is by examination, still unfairness and injustice was likely to arise from the sudden change?—I don't agree with all that statement, Mr. Conry. I would not object to examination, but he did not examine under proper conditions. No notice was given of the examination. The examination was even held at an unsuitable time. I have given the case of an examination held while epidemics were in progress, and at other unsuitable times, and he went through the whole year's programme in the first few months. I do not object to examinations in themselves, but they ought to be held under proper conditions.

21799. You have told us, and we have had evidence of it—and this is one of the questions I wanted to ask you—that apart from the discontent and dissatisfaction, of which we heard a great deal in connection with Clonmel, you have documentary evidence of the discontent with the present system of inspection very widespread and not confined to any particular district?—Not confined to any particular district, but more in evidence in Clonmel and Belfast districts. There is another district, and I dare say you will have evidence from it, that is the Castlebar district, there is general discontent there also.

21800. You told us yesterday that you held first at Thurles a county meeting, and that subsequently you had a meeting at Tipperary, and that you then decided to memorialise the Board, individual appeals having had no redress?—Yes, that is so. Individual appeals by teachers, where marks were reduced, even by two steps, were refused, no reasons being usually assigned. When there was any answer they were told that there was no reason to interfere with the mark of the inspector, and in one case it was stated that they believed in the competency of their inspectors to examine the schools.

21801. You had a later meeting at which you decided to send a memorial to the Board?—That is so.

21802. And the result of that memorial was the re-inspection of the district by Mr. Hynde, so that the teachers even then got no redress?—No redress; and even when the mark was raised, it was only when your first Blue Book was printed that we knew of it. My report from the junior inspector, which was "good," did not reach me at the time of Mr. Hynde's visit. He raised it to "very good," yet it was the junior's mark case.

21803. Mr. Hynde, as chief inspector, gave you "very good"?—Yes.

21804. So that notwithstanding individual appeals and this general memorial, the teachers were denied any redress or recognition that a wrong was done them?—That is so.

Then you had a meeting of the teachers at Clonmel, at which you made this speech, which afterwards led to your removal by the Board. The speech, as I read it, consists of two parts; the first a criticism upon Mr. Welby.—

21805. The *Chairman*.—May I suggest that the exact date should be given?—The 18th July.

21806. Mr. *Conry*.—Part of the speech was criticism of Mr. Welby, and part was, I think, political, or very strongly on the line of politics?—Well, yes; but as a matter of fact, we make it a point to avoid party politics in our Organisation. You are aware that we have in our Organisation Unionists, Nationalists, and men of all shades of opinion, and we do not indulge in party political speeches. There are occasions when it is absolutely impossible to avoid the discussion of such matters as the Education Grant and similar questions without infringing on the domain of politics.

21801A. I think this speech of yours more than trenchant on the domain of politics; but I only want to ask you did you think that you were in any way violating the rules of the Board of National Education, which are not very pronounced. It contains some things that might be regarded as political allusions?—Certainly they might. We had interviews with three or four prominent politicians, including the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Redmond and Mr. Dillon, and some others, in connection with our Pension Scheme. I dealt with these.

21802. I only ask this: In this speech, as printed in the *Clonmel Chronicle*, do you recognise that it contained a political allusion?—I made no political allusion more than I could help in the interest of education and of our Organisation. I wished to make the position of our Organisation clear regarding certain matters, and to prevent the Organisation really from being dragged into party politics.

21803. I would like to say that I think that you have spoken in your evidence very reasonably, and I would say considerably and kindly, of Mr. Weply, having regard to the circumstances?—I do not wish him any harm.

21804. May I take it that this criticism of Mr. Weply was as much, perhaps more, in the interest of the education of the district, with which you were connected, than as a charge or complaint of injustice against Mr. Weply?—Of course, it was in the interests of education. I wished, if possible, to get rid of the friction in Tipperary, and we were trying to bring that about by suggesting to the Commissioners, in as mild a way as we could, his removal to another circuit, where he would have a better chance, and we would have a better chance, and because education would do better if he was removed. You must remember that this criticism was made at a private meeting.

21805. It became public afterwards?—I had at that time before me the view of Mr. Purser, that our appeals to the Board were futile, and the only other way that we could deal with severe inspectors was by concerted action, and by getting the matter exposed in Parliament. I was certainly annoyed. I knew that Dr. Sturkie, in whom for a long time I had confidence, was making admirable speeches, while no teacher suffering was getting justice. The letter of Mr. Purser, with which all the teachers in Clonmel had become acquainted, exasperated me and every other teacher present.

21806. Did you recognise that in that speech, so far as it was a criticism of Mr. Weply, that you were violating any rules of the Board?—No. I did not know any rule of the Board that would prevent me dealing with it publicly; but this, as I say, was a private sitting.

21807. But you didn't know any rule of the Board that would prevent you doing it even publicly?—No. I did not know any rule of the Board that would prevent me doing it.

21808. Would you willingly or knowingly violate a rule of the Board under which you served?—There are extreme cases in which I might.

21809. That is not the answer I expected?—If people do not violate rules sometimes there is little chance of redress. I tried to keep within the rules of the Board, and I believe I did, at the Clonmel meeting, but I would not commit myself further.

21810. The official evidence that you have had here made it quite clear that you had good ground for complaint at Clonmel?—We were convinced at that time that we had, and even if we were not convinced, the evidence that you have published would have convinced us. Of course, anybody knowing the conditions there, knowing the teachers were conscientious, hard-working men, capable and honest in their work, getting eight or nine "very goods" in inspection, and then being dropped to "fair," must have been convinced that there was something wrong, and appeals to the Board brought no redress.

21811. At any rate, the National Board asked you to repudiate this criticism of Mr. Weply?—Yes, after a long and unfair correspondence. Besides my ordinary school work, I spent that summer, night after night, studying 80 or 81 volumes of Blue Books, for an interview with the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Then, of course, there was a lot of

other work, endeavouring to get friends in Parliament to support our views and to have a debate. Most of my vacation went in that way. Again, during the month of June, every night I was working at this—I was fagged out. The interview with the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the crossing to London took a week out of my vacation; then during the month of July I was looking up various documents in preparation for a financial pamphlet, and then I had to cross to London for the Debate on the 31st of July. Then Miss Mahon and I attempted to get an interview at the Education Office; we waited for five hours trying to see the Board on an urgent matter regarding pensions. We were refused. I went to Linschowna, expecting to have a week of quiet. Then came the wire from the Commissioners demanding an immediate answer, upon which depended my career as a teacher.

21812. Whatever political references there are in that speech of yours, you seem to have been drawn into them by what I might call the bad example of the Resident Commissioner?—Well, as a matter of fact, no matter what Party was in power, we have been fighting for more money for education. On account of the political tension at this time, due to the Home Rule measure, while presenting our views to Valence and Nationalist politicians, we did not wish to come out, as it were, to attack the Home Rule Bill.

21813. Mr. HARRIS.—Why should you?—Dr. Sturkie, at Cork, made an attack upon the finances of the Home Rule Bill, and it was whispered that he had been silenced by Mr. Redmond and Mr. Dillon regarding this question. That is untrue. Otherwise it was said we would come out and attack the Home Rule Bill, and I have heard from a Commissioner since that he thought the publication of a certain document by the National Board was an attack on Home Rule. They had published a manifesto regarding the finances of the Bill, and Dr. Sturkie, in Cork, had invited all and sundry, who had the interests of their country at heart, to come out and speak at this crisis. I think it would be a dangerous thing for our Organisation to be dragged into political matters at that time. We certainly would not have come forward if the Nationalist politicians asked us to come out and publish a manifesto, to say that the finances of the Bill were all right, just as we would refuse to make an attack upon the finances of the Bill for the other side.

21814. Who asked you to make an attack upon it?—Well, of course, we had the example of the National Board, and the example of Dr. Sturkie at Cork. For the first time in its long career, the National Board came out publicly on the question of education finances, and, further, there was an undercurrent, and rumours circulated among the Belfast teachers and others that we had been silenced by Mr. Redmond and Mr. Dillon regarding criticism of the Bill, and even in the school journal, which is published by an Educational Company, the tone of the articles was to the effect that we were not acting as we wished. I wish to make our position clear as regards that at Clonmel. We have always exposed the financial grievance, but why should we attack the Home Rule Bill?

21815. Mr. CONNERY.—At all events, you refused to repudiate the criticism of Mr. Weply and this speech sent to you in the *Clonmel Chronicle*?—I certainly did, because, of course, from my letter you will see that the Commissioners knew already my views upon the question, and to repudiate publicly views which I firmly believed in, and which they knew I believed in, would have rendered me unfit to be a teacher. I admit that the tone of the first letter, perhaps, is not what it ought to be. But the Board, not I, was responsible for the tone.

21816. The CHAIRMAN.—Is that the letter of September 1st, 1917?—No, August 18th. You must remember the circumstances under which that letter was written. Various wires came, and at the last moment, on Monday evening, 18th August, I had a statement to prepare, which could not be delayed, upon the Pension question. A wire came from the National Board, insisting that a reply should be in next day. I was writing the other statement until eight o'clock. My bicycle was broken, the post had gone; it was 4 very wet evening, and I had to write this document

3rd September, 1913.]

Mr. E. MANSFIELD examined.

[Continued.]

and tramp four miles to the Lincolnton Junction, and when I got there I found I forgot the *Nationalist* cutting, and I ran four miles for it and back in order to get that in. All this before 12 p.m.

21817. Mr. COFFEY.—I may take it, I think, from what you say, Mr. Mansfield, that you don't regard the tone of these first letters in your calmer moments as defensible?—If the Board had treated me fairly I would not have dreamt of writing such a letter to the Board. I was exasperated and rushed into writing that letter.

21818. May I take it you recognise now it is a letter you should not have written?—I'll not go to that extent, Mr. Coffey. I believe in normal conditions it is a letter that should not be written, but the conditions were not normal. If I had to write it again I would express myself differently, or if I had got more time for consideration I should have expressed myself differently.

21819. Having failed to reproduce this speech of yours, the National Board passed a resolution saying they would no longer recognise you as a teacher?—Yes.

21820. And in reply to that letter, and even to-day, you have said that you are not aware of having violated any rule of the Commissioners?—That is so. I asked the Board twice to state what rule I had violated. I asked them also to supply a marked copy of the *Chronicle*. I had to write my defence without having the charge before me, and without being informed by the Board of the rule I had violated. You must remember that all that correspondence was wrong from me in direct violation of one of the Board's own rules, by which correspondence must come through the manager. Over and over again documents have been sent back to teachers that have not gone through the manager. In this case, where they wanted to penalise me, and were in a hurry to do so, they set aside their own rules, and rushed me into this explanation, because certainly this correspondence was rushed.

21821. You have something to say and something to object to in the way the case is submitted, presumably, to the Chief Secretary later on?—Oh, certainly.

21822. Inasmuch as in the correspondence sent to the Chief Secretary, cut from the *Freeman's Journal* of the 29th October, 1912, the Education Office quite unfairly did not include a letter which appeared from you on the following day in the *Freeman's Journal*?—In the first place, I did not think that that other letter of the *Chronicle* Editor should have gone at par with the correspondence to Mr. Birrell, especially as a letter of mine flatly contradicting these things was omitted, and that is a matter I should like to have inserted to the minutes. I have had a number of wires from teachers present at the meeting.—

21823. The unfairness was in not including your letter as well as that?—Yes, my repudiation of the statement given in the letter of Mr. Ross Burns.

The CHAIRMAN.—That letter can go in.

21824. Mr. COFFEY.—Read what appeared in the *Freeman's Journal*?—

"To the Editor of the *Freeman's Journal*."

"Sir,—The letter of Mr. Ross Burns, Editor, *Chronicle*, in this day's issue of the *Freeman*, was not necessary to assure me that it was through a misapprehension on the part of his correspondent, who, I believe, is an honourable man and a good reporter, that neither appeared regarding the inspector, which, for the sake of the teachers present, I requested the reporter to regard as confidential. Without the Editor's assurance, I also believed that the report was inserted in good faith. But in the notes inserted in his paper on Wednesday last—there were two inconsistent notes in two different editions—and in his letter to you he does himself an injustice. He need not fear that he will prejudice my case in the least. I stand by every word I stated in the correspondence with the Board, and can furnish proofs if necessary. Moreover, all—excepting one or two slight inaccuracies—that the *Chronicle* printed I believe to be true. My only reason in requesting privacy in this particular matter

was that the teachers present might not be backed up by the Board, as they have been in similar cases elsewhere. A representative teacher must, however, be prepared to face the music, and in my private correspondence to the Board, and in my presidential address at Bangor, I had uttered criticisms equally strong, but, I think, perfectly legitimate, about the Board and this very official. As the first edition of the *Chronicle* conveyed the impression that there was no question of privacy, I immediately sent the following wire to a number of representative teachers:—'*Chronicle* denies my request privacy. Claimed meeting. Wire your recollection.—Mansfield.' Every teacher communicated with agreed that my version was absolutely true, and members I have since heard from corroborated this. Mr. E. Crowe, Galbally, wired:—'Have distinct recollection of your request to the Press to treat your communication to teachers at Council as confidential.—Crowe.'

"(2) Mr. M. O'Gorman, B.A., Kilsnade, Treasurer, Co. Association, wired:—'Recall your saying statement private—not for Press—reporters needed assent.—O'Gorman.'

"(3) Mr. Michael Kearney, Chairman, Benewent Fund, I.T.N.O., wired:—'Kearney or Crowe mentioned, within hearing reporters. Remarks private. Understood they knew.—Kearney.'

"(4) Mr. C. McKeown, Chairman, Tipperary Teachers' Association, wired:—'Recall your remark of privacy to be observed.—McKeown.'

"There is no need to add more than the following brief observations:—

"(a) The leading politician referred to is Mr. Lloyd George, with whom we had two interviews a fortnight before, and so far from there being no reference to this in the report, as the editor says, he will find my summary in *Chronicle* just as I wrote it, omitting confidential parts. In the *Chronicle* he will also find my summarised remarks in confidential interview with Commissioners regarding Materiality Rule, as well as my summary of my observations on Commissioners and Home Rule Finance. I also furnished in one or two sentences a summary of my observations regarding senior inspectors. This was omitted from *Chronicle* report, and what was written in paragraph headed 'Senior Inspectors' was taken from the correspondent's own notes, and not from my written statement.

"(b) Any person who looks over *Chronicle* can easily see that reporter repeats in his part what I had already summarised, as printed in first portion of report. The overlapping is apparent.

"(c) Surely it is not necessary to shut doors on reporters to make meetings private.

"Several teachers were present while I wrote statement, and when I handed it in to *Chronicle* correspondent.

"As I wish to get this very hurried letter inserted to-morrow, I shall conclude by saying that at *Chronicle* my aim was to controvert the practice and the proceedings of the Resident Commissioners regarding inspection; to expose the hypocrisy of the Commissioners regarding educational finance, and to prevent as far as I could our organisation—while working strenuously for financial justice—from being dragged into the political mess in which the Commissioners have landed themselves; to keep our Organisation a non-political and non-sectarian one, clear of party and free from the influence of those who in the past proved anything but friendly.

"Yours,

"(Signed), E. MANSFIELD."

21825. That was the letter to the *Freeman's Journal*?—Yes.

21826. And that was not included in the correspondence sent to the Chief Secretary?—No; and I have here an extract from the *Chronicle* notes, which shows I am right.

21827. We have nothing to do with that. The point is that I think you were unfairly treated when they sent these documents to the Chief Secretary in not including that also?—I think it was most unfair.

2nd September, 1913.]

Mr. E. MANSFIELD examined.

[Continued.]

21828. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—Did not Canon O'Neill reply?—That was just after my dismissal. I believe when those letters were inserted that the letter of mine in reply should have been inserted, and since they went out of their way to fish up those things, I think they might have got the manager's letter and sent it in also.

21829. Mr. CORRY.—Now we come to the question of Civil Rights in your notes. Will you develop that point as to what the teachers want under the heading of "Civil Rights"?—That has a bearing on my case. In connection with my dismissal, perhaps I might mention that the school is being taught as it was in the past, the children are attending, and my wife, who, of course, has to control over me, or responsibility for my action, was dismissed also by the Board from the 30th June last. She is a trained and fully certificated teacher, and her record highly satisfactory.

21830. The CHAIRMAN.—On what ground?—On the ground that all grants were to be withdrawn from the school if a successor to me in that school were not appointed by the manager.

21831. The BANCOR or ROSS.—Is it a mixed school?—It is a boys' school.

21832. Is your wife the assistant?—I'll tell you the facts. I dealt in part with this question yesterday. The average went up to 50, and the Board were trying to force out the junior assistant mistress. She had got another junior assistant in another school to promise to exchange, so that Miss Cleary could go to the other school, and the junior assistant mistress in the other school could come to mine. That was arranged, and just before the change was about being made Miss Cleary said to me:—"I am not quite sure that I won't give up teaching altogether. I am afraid I will not have very much of a life under Mr. Welby, and, besides, I intend going to my brother in America at Christmas." "Well," said I, "in that case, perhaps, I could get my wife appointed here." She said, "I am sorry I did not know that sooner." Then I said, "Since you only intend to remain until Christmas, and if you do not go to the other school, I will give you compensation, and I hope my wife will be appointed here," and I offered her a year and a half's salary. She would not accept a year and a half's salary, but she accepted nine months', covering the time which she intended to remain in the other school. This was at Easter, but, of course, I was dismissed in a few months. I wish to bring out that point, to show that I was anxious my wife might be teaching with me, and, therefore, I went to the trouble of getting this done. Three years ago I could have been appointed Secretary to the Teachers' Organization. Last year a number of teachers asked me to go forward, and I had definitely refused. I intended to support another teacher for the Secretaryship. I wish to get that down for this reason. It was stated by an official of the Board of Education that I simply got dismissed in order to qualify for the Secretaryship, a position I could have got without being dismissed at all. The then Secretary was quite satisfied to retire at any time in my favour. I think it was very unjust for an official of the Board to make such a statement. Of course, the teachers do not believe it, but it has been stated to teachers in the Dublin circuit, and to managers here and there throughout the country.

21833. The CHAIRMAN.—You were telling us something about Mrs. Mansfield's dismissal?—I bring these things forward to show my intention was to remain in the Cullen School, and not to go for the position I held temporarily, and to refute the statement that officials of the Board made. My wife has been dismissed.

21834. Mr. HENRY.—On the ground that there is no principal in the school?—Yes, that is the ground; but I could point to a case in which a junior assistant mistress was recognised for twelve months, while the principal in charge was not.

21835. The CHAIRMAN.—Is there no principal in the school?—I am the principal of the school.

21836. You are principal still, but not recognised by the Board?—Not recognised by the Board. In order to help me to carry on the work of the Secretaryship I employed another, who is the teacher, and teaches

there occasionally when I cannot be there. He is a fully qualified trained teacher, but he is not recognised by the Board; he is acting as my substitute.

Mr. HENRY.—The case is sad justice.

21837. The CHAIRMAN.—The school is still going on as usual?—The school is going on as usual, the children are attending as usual, and the manager, who is a very good man, and has been very kind to me, and feels that I was unjustly treated, is not inclined to appoint a principal instead of me, and has said:—"We will let matters stand as they are."

21838. You are paid for doing the school work?—There is no payment from the Board. The junior assistant mistress in the case I mentioned was paid for upwards of a year, but no salary was drawn by the principal, and I believe that distinction was made as against my wife, who is a fully qualified certificated teacher, and to have her salary cut off, while the salary of a junior assistant in another school was paid, the junior assistant being responsible for the work in the other school, was decidedly unfair.

21839. Mr. HENRY.—Have you Canon O'Neill's letter referring to this correspondence?—No, but I'll be able to get a copy of that letter.

21840. The BANCOR or ROSS.—Was Canon O'Neill written to by the Board?—No; the letter* we are referring to is Canon O'Neill's reply to the order of the Board dismissing me.

21841. The CHAIRMAN.—Is the letter of Canon O'Neill a reply to the letter on page 222 of the 15th of October?—Yes, it is a reply to that letter.

21842. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—It appears in one of the pamphlets of your Organisation?—I should like that it would go in.

21843. Mr. HENRY.—You can furnish it?—Yes.

21844. You said you have violated no rule of the Board?—None, so far as I know, or so far as I was made aware of. I asked the Commissioners on two separate occasions to inform me what rule I had violated.

21845. Apart from any justification or non-justification of the letter, do you think it was a fair mode of dealing with a grave case of this kind to be called upon to answer it by wire?—I consider it most unfair. I was really rushed into the explanation upon which my position, as I found afterwards, depended, and in violation of one of the Board's own rules.

21846. What do you object to in the mode of procedure adopted?—Well, in the first place, they insisted upon my explanation without furnishing me with a copy of the charges, without furnishing me with a copy of the *Gleaned Chronicle*, in which the report appeared, and which I had not before me when furnishing my explanation, and they insisted upon this being sent on immediately, not through the manager, but direct to the Board, in violation of one of their own rules.

21847. What is the rule, because you must not take it for granted that everyone knows these rules?—I think it is 40 (6).

Will you read that rule?—

The CHAIRMAN.—I will read it:—"The manager is charged with the direct government of the school, the appointment of the teachers, subject to the approval of the Commissioners, and their removal, and the conducting of the necessary correspondence with the Commissioners."—Yes, that is the rule. Their procedure was against the usual practice of the Board, that correspondence should come through the manager. I did reply to the charge concerning the senior inspector. Then they sent me a marked copy of the *Chronicle*, bringing in other charges not mentioned in the wire to which I referred. In other words, they amended the indictment against me.

21848. Mr. HENRY.—Of course, you have Rule 62?—"The Commissioners, as a rule, do not correspond directly with the teachers, except as provided in Rules 69, 90, and 96, and Rule 90 has reference to a teacher's dismissal for inefficiency, and Rule 96 has reference to the management, discipline, and method of instruction, and 96 has reference to complaints against the manager or inspector." In any case, the ordinary minute should be sent in duplicate to the teacher.

21849. Of course, they have a saving clause in

* Vide Appendix LIV.

Rule 65, that is, the statement, "The Commissioners, as a rule"—I suppose the exception would be where they wished to penalise the teacher?

21848. I do not know what the exception would be, but in any case do you think it a fair thing or a reasonable thing that a teacher should be liable, even supposing he is guilty of some offence, to be dismissed without enquiry except through telegram?—Of course, I think it unfair.

21849. You think you should have been given the ordinary course of investigation?—And that I should have been given time, and have got a copy of the charges.

21851. They did not give you any information at all as to what your offence was?—No, except to ask me for my observations regarding this paragraph headed "Senior Inspector" in the *Clonmel Chronicle*, a copy of which I had not before me when I was forced to reply.

21852. Am I rightly informed that you asked for time, and that you were on vacation?—Yes, the manager was just going on holidays, and I will tell you what occurred. I had returned from Dublin. I was at the Education Office about the Pension Scheme. I went home, and found that the manager had sent word that he wished to see me, so I went up to him, and he said to me, "You were away during last week, and I have here a document from the office, and I happened to get a copy of the *Chronicle*. Will you glance over it, or will you take it away?"—I glanced at it at Lattin, where the manager lives. I had to cycle to see Mr. Ryan, of Knockliff, and in cycling back from Knockliff I lost the *Chronicle*, so that when I replied to this I had only the general effect of the *Chronicle* report in my mind. Of course, I knew exactly what was in the statement which I handed to the reporter, as I kept a copy. I made three copies in Clonmel, and handed one to the *Nationalist* reporter, and the other to the *Chronicle* reporter. I hadn't any notes at all for the Clonmel meeting. I was late for the meeting, and when I went in they pressed me to speak, and to tell them my views on the education question.

21853. Your offence was that you criticised the Senior Inspector at a meeting, which you considered and regarded as a private meeting of your own professional brethren, but it got in some way into the papers, and then you were called upon to repeat it?—I believe the statement, of course, to be true which the *Chronicle* did put in.

21854. You believe you made that statement?—I think I made that statement; to the best of my recollection these statements were made.

21855. Do you think it is consistent with the position of a teacher at the present time, or an official, in the interests of the education of the country that teachers could not meet together, and discuss the state of education in their district, and the treatment meted out to them by the inspectors?—I think it would be bad for education. I think teachers should get an opportunity of discussing freely in a temperate way all that bears upon their position, and upon education.

21856. And have you good cause for complaint in that district?—Very good cause for complaint, and we had tried all means within the rules of the Board to get matters remedied, and we believed that appeals to the Board were absolutely futile.

21857. It was only in such circumstances that people would use language which perhaps would be heated, and which they would regret in calmer moments?—That is true, but I stated the truth. I stated what I believed to be true at all events.

21858. Don't you think that should be taken into consideration when dealing with your case?—Yes, and that the statement was made at a private meeting.

21859. Made at a private sitting, and under circumstances in which the teachers had considerable cause for complaint, and when there would be likely to be more or less temper?—That is so. From February the 15th, 1910, to July 15th, 1912, we had tried every means to get the Board to investigate our charges against the inspectors. We asked for investigation, and the Board would not give us a fair trial.

21860. As far as you know from your position as Secretary to the Organisation, have English teachers ever exercised the right of criticising their inspectors?—Certainly, on far less serious causes to my mind, than that which we were discussing, they started an agitation, and got rid, not merely of the Secretary to the Education Board in England, but of the Minister of Education.

21861. Has education suffered in England on account of the freedom which the teachers enjoy?—I think it is for the good of education that the teachers who are fairly well educated and have some sense of responsibility should be given an opportunity of expressing their opinion, as the teachers in England and Scotland have.

21862. The CHAIRMAN.—You say that agitation amongst the English teachers drove out the English Minister of Education?—Following an agitation by the English teachers, Sir Robert Morant was transferred to the Insurance Commissioners, and Mr. Runciman was transferred from the Board of Education to the Board of Agriculture. I believe the freedom the English teachers enjoy in civil rights is all to the good of education, and I do not see why teachers, who are fairly educated people, with some sense of responsibility, should not be given the opportunity of expressing their views temperately like other members of the community, and if that freedom is given to the teachers of England and Scotland, under the same system of Government, I do not see why the Irish teachers should not get the same freedom. Some people have said that political feeling does not run as high in England and Scotland as in Ireland. I have been present at meetings in Trafalgar Square, where feeling ran very high, and it is not a dozen years ago since the present Chancellor of the Exchequer had to make his escape in Birmingham in a policeman's jacket. Had as we are in this country I do not think anything like that would happen to the Chancellor or Chief Secretary.

21863. Mr. HARRISON.—What reason have you to think that it was the teachers that drove Sir Robert Morant from the Board of Education, because I am bound to say it is the first time I ever heard that statement made?—Sir Robert Morant had been for a long time engaged in the Education Department in London, and Mr. Runciman was the Minister of Education. A certain circular was issued to which English teachers took grave exception, and, as I said, they had far less grounds for complaint than we had in the Tipperary district. An agitation followed which led to the removal of these two gentlemen from the Education Department. Sir Robert Morant was transferred to the Insurance Commissioners, and Mr. Runciman to the Board of Agriculture.

21864. Mr. HEERY.—There is another case to which I would direct your attention, with the facts of which I know you are fully acquainted. You remember the case where Mr. MacSwiney criticised an inspector?—Yes, in the Press.

21865. To a large extent, it was somewhat the same offence as yours?—Yes, but it was more definite than my speech.

21866. Will you tell us what mode was adopted by the Commissioners, because I know you were present in Mr. MacSwiney's case?—In Mr. MacSwiney's case he got notice from the office that two chiefs of inspection would hold an investigation, and the two chiefs of inspection went down to Anghrim to Mr. MacSwiney's school. Of course, he got reasonable notice, and time to make up his defence, and an investigation was held.

21867. The CHAIRMAN.—What was the charge against Mr. MacSwiney?—He had criticised Doctor Alexander in the Press.

21868. Mr. HEERY.—Your offence was committed at a private meeting?—Yes.

21869. At that investigation held by the two chief inspectors had Mr. MacSwiney any assistance allowed him?—There was a solicitor present, and a shorthand note-taker, and I also was present on behalf of the Organisation.

3rd September, 1918.]

Mr. E. MANSFIELD examined.

[Continued.]

21870. Had the solicitor a right to put questions?—Well, we were led to believe that the solicitor would have a right to put questions, but he was not allowed to put any question.

21871. You were led to believe he would be allowed?—Well, Dr. Starke promised a deputisation that the solicitor would have an opportunity of putting questions through the presiding officer.

21872. But even if he did not put questions, was he there to give advice to Mr. MacSwenny?—Yes.

21873. Did you advise him?—I consulted with him privately.

21874. And gave the best advice you could?—Yes, the best I could, but I was not allowed to speak openly.

21875. The fact is that for the same officer, criticising an inspector in a letter in the one case, and in the other in a speech, there is a totally different mode of procedure adopted in the two cases?—Yes, that is so.

21876. And, as a result of the enquiry in Anghrim, what was Mr. MacSwenny requested to do?—Mr. MacSwenny wrote a statement at the request of the inspectors; his statement was taken down by the two inspectors, and he signed it, and this was sent on to the Board.

21877. What was the nature of the statement?—The nature of the statement was that while he was prepared to justify his letter as a whole—I do not remember the exact words—he was sorry if any expression he used in this letter would in any way reflect upon Dr. Alexander, who was mentioned by name in the letter.

21878. And what was the punishment as far as you are aware?—I am not aware; the matter has not been decided yet.

21879. I suppose you know privately what will be the nature of it?—I have heard the matter will be dropped altogether.

21880. So that in your case, having committed the same offence?—Mine was less, having been made at a private meeting.

21881. At all events, for criticism of an inspector, who appeared in the Press, in Mr. MacSwenny's case, over his own name, there was a different mode of procedure to what occurred in your case?—That is so.

21882. In other words, did you get as fair a trial and opportunity to defend yourself as he did?—No. My idea is that from the first the Board intended to dismiss me and to run me out of the service.

21883. You believe you did not get a fair trial?—I believe I got no trial.

21884. One last question. Do you think it would be an advantage if teachers had, under the heading of "Civil Rights," freedom to discuss political matters?—I think it would. Education, at many points, is mixed up with politics, so much so that sometimes you cannot separate them. For instance, if you discuss questions of the Education Grants—

21885. I think you are allowed to do that at present?—Well, I do not see why the teacher, any more than anyone else, should be hampered in that way. It might be well that teachers should be mixed up in party politics.

21886. Where would the benefit arise supposing teachers were allowed to mix themselves up in party battles?—Why should not a teacher be given an opportunity of making a fool of himself as a Commissioner of Education or manager is?

21887. That is not the question I am asking you. I am asking where would the gain be?—Well, I will tell you. In 1909 there was the Development Grant of £265,000 hanging in the balance. It was a grant for Education. England got its share, and Scotland got its share. England got £1,350,000, and Scotland got £212,000. In Ireland it was confiscated, and I believe if teachers had an opportunity of expressing their views freely that grant would not have gone from education.

21888. That is a matter of opinion. Do you think you could have brought as much pressure to bear upon the Government as those looking for grants for the Dingle Railway and the Norey Railway, and for the landlords to smooth the machinery for the sale of the

land to the tenants?—We would have had a fair opportunity for exposing the injustice done to Irish education. This grant, badly needed for education, went to other purposes. The Board's rules allowed us and the grant went to Land Act purposes.

21889. At present you can go on a platform in any part of the country, and discuss as freely as you like the claims of Ireland for educational advance. There is no restriction whatever?—No restriction!—

21890. None whatever?—Why then were passages marked for observation in the copy of the *Cleveland Chronicle* dealing with educational finance, and our action in connection with the Education Office's belated interest in finance.

21891. You were asked to repudiate the statement regarding Mr. Welchy?—In the amended indictment, they sent a copy of the *Chronicle*, and in the report they marked off portions dealing with finance, and my opinion was, and is, that they were more concerned with the criticisms levelled at the Commissioners regarding Home Rule than with those of the inspector.

21892. How could you come to that conclusion when it was only the portion connected with Mr. Welchy that you were asked to repudiate?—I was asked for an explanation regarding both.

21893. You were asked to repudiate publicly the statement attributed to you in the *Cleveland Chronicle* of the 17th July, 1912, with reference to the senior inspector?—They avoided the reference to education finance there altogether, but in the amended copy of the indictment against me, accompanied by a copy of the *Chronicle*, the portion dealing with the education finance was marked, and I was asked to furnish my observations on the marked portion. As a matter of fact, from what occurred then, I should not feel free at the present time if I were subject to the control of the Board to deal with questions of education finance on a teachers' platform.

21894. I think you might as freely as you liked. At any rate, you think you were unfairly treated and condemned without being given a proper opportunity of defending yourself, and proper time to defend yourself?—That is so.

21895. And that a mode of procedure at least somewhat similar in the case of Mr. MacSwenny, for a similar offence, should have been followed in your case; and your manager evidently is of that opinion, seeing he retains you in the service?—The manager is of that opinion.

21896. And the people of the locality must be of the same opinion, too, since they continue the attendance of their children at your school?—That is so.

21897. And, therefore, as far as your neighbours and the people who know you best are concerned, they believe that you have been harshly, and, I think I will add, unfairly treated?—Yes.

21898. The tone of your letter was objectionable, and it was a letter you would not have written in calmer moments?—I was rushed into writing the letter, and if I had an opportunity of properly considering it, it is probable I would not have put it in that way. I was not responsible for anything objectionable in its tone, but the Commissioners themselves were. I had the example of Dr. Starke to guide me regarding my criticisms of the Board. He was a Civil Servant, and he apparently felt perfectly free to attack everybody. I was not a Civil Servant at all, and was not bound by the rules of the Civil Service. He escapes, I gather.

21899. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Would you explain, Mr. Mansfield, exactly what was done with regard to the withdrawal of salary in the case of Mrs. Mansfield?—I will tell you exactly what occurred. The manager knows when I am reinstated I'll go back to the school, and when he was asked to appoint a successor to me, he knew, of course, this Commission was sitting to try the grievances under the inspection system, and he said, "Well, it is probable you will be reinstated," and he wrote to the Board and said, "For the present I cannot see my way to appoint a successor." They wrote back saying the grant would be withdrawn from the school from the 30th June, and the grant, having been withdrawn, that means, of course, my wife is to get no salary.

3rd September, 1913.]

Mr. E. MANSFIELD examined.

[Continued.]

21960. The CHAIRMAN.—She is not personally mentioned—No! The manager is not in fault, the people are not in fault, nor is she, yet the grants are withdrawn.

21961. There was no reflection whatever by the Board on Mrs. Mansfield as a teacher—No, her reports are "very good," and there is no complaint against her.

21962. The BRANOR or ROSS.—Mr. Elliott came here to give evidence, and he is Treasurer of your Organisation?—Yes.

21963. And he came here to represent the Irish National Teachers' Organisation?—He came here as one of the Belfast witnesses.

21964. No, he stated he came to represent your Organisation?—He was one of the witnesses selected by the Belfast teachers to give evidence.

21965. On behalf of your Organisation, not the Belfast teachers?—Well, every teacher who has so far gone here has not been nominated by the Organisation. Of course, somebody made the selection.

21966. He drew a distinction; he came to represent the Organisation, and not of the Belfast teachers?—Yes; I accept that, as he is Treasurer.

21967. And he put in evidence this pamphlet as part of his evidence. It is the Irish Protestant Teachers' Annual, 1910?—We have nothing in the world to do with their pamphlets.

21968. But he is a member of the Irish National Teachers' Organisation, and I want to see whether you will accept this language or not—I will not express any opinion upon that question. With regard to the managerial question I have no authority to express any opinion on behalf of our organisation.

21969. But he put this pamphlet in as evidence?—I think it was a mistake on Mr. Elliott's part to put it in.

21970. If you do not repudiate it, I will hold the Organisation bound to the view that is here expressed?—Before we go into any particular points dealing with the Protestant Teachers' Organisation I wish to make an explanation. On the managerial question I have no authority to speak on behalf of my Organisation.

21971. Not Mr. Elliott has?—It has been excluded from the platform of our Organisation, and by common consent of all National teachers. The Catholic teachers are satisfied with the safeguards they have in the Maynooth resolution.

21972. That settles the whole point. You speak on behalf of the Catholic teachers, and in your capacity as Secretary of the Organisation you say the teachers are satisfied with the Maynooth resolution?—I say it not merely on behalf of the Organisation, but it is my own private and personal view. I speak of Catholic teachers.

21973. I don't mean your own opinion, but it is the opinion of the Organisation?—That is so.

21974. I don't ask you to express any opinion, but Mr. Elliott put this in and wished to have it printed as part of his evidence as representing the Organisation. You see the point?—Yes; I see the point.

21975. You tell me now it does not represent the views of the Organisation?—I won't express an opinion regarding that pamphlet at all. If you ask me a question on the Irish National Teachers' Organisation, I will express my views and hand in the rules and statute books; there is nothing private in them—but with regard to the Protestant teachers I don't express any opinion. I think they know that opinion.

I have nothing to say to opponents. I am only talking of the evidence.

The CHAIRMAN.—Was Mr. Elliott examined upon that pamphlet?—

21976. The BRANOR or ROSS.—He put this pamphlet in, and here is the sentence to which I directed his attention: "The majority, bought off with a sham settlement, consented to abandon the minority." I asked was that "sham settlement" the "Maynooth resolution," and he said it was—I don't think it is quite fair to have reference to the managerial question at all going down in the notes of my evidence.

He put this in his evidence?—

The CHAIRMAN.—Was he examined upon it?—

The BRANOR or ROSS.—He put it in, and asked to have it printed.

21977. The CHAIRMAN.—I did my best to keep the managerial question out?—Seeing the managerial question was outside the scope of your terms of reference, and as you did not print any circular to the managers, I think it would be just as well if evidence should not be asked of me on the managerial question.

The BRANOR or ROSS.—And it would have been better if Mr. Elliott did not put in this matter.

21978. Mr. HARRISON.—Is it not?—I doubt it very much.

Mr. HENRY.—If he put it in at all it was only introduced to show what the Protestant teachers were doing.

21979. The BRANOR or ROSS.—I am quite satisfied with Mr. Mansfield's predication of the views of the Organisation?—I have stated my views, and that being the case and seeing the managerial question is excluded, while I don't mind it going down in evidence, it leaves it open to other witnesses to deal more fully with the managerial question. Your reference excludes it.

The CHAIRMAN.—I really will not have it. I have tried to keep the managerial question without the preview of the Committee because we all know it is an extremely delicate and troublesome question.

Mr. HARRISON.—That being so, would it not be well to have it expunged from the notes?

21980. The BRANOR or ROSS.—I wish to have the statement down that in his capacity as representing the Teachers' Organisation Mr. Elliott regards the Maynooth resolutions as a sham settlement. I am quite satisfied with Mr. Mansfield's view when, as Secretary of the Organisation, he states that the National teachers are quite satisfied with the Maynooth resolutions?—I put it this way: the Catholic teachers are satisfied with the Maynooth resolution—as Secretary to the Organisation I am not saying a word for or against the managerial question—I say the Catholic teachers of Ireland are satisfied with the safeguards in the Maynooth resolution, but seeing that this is excluded from your terms of reference and seeing it is excluded from the scope of the work of our Organisation, I don't think it is quite fair to get down on the minutes of evidence my views upon that question. I would be ready to express them publicly in the Press.

The BRANOR or ROSS.—Mr. Elliott came here as a representative of your Organisation and put this in evidence.

The CHAIRMAN.—If it is in evidence I am to blame for it.

Mr. HENRY.—It ought to be expunged.

The BRANOR or ROSS.—If we expunge all reference to this pamphlet and also another pamphlet that Mr. Elliott referred to, called "Secular Control of Secular Education," I am satisfied. He brought this into the evidence in which he told us that he himself supplied the information on the managerial question, and he told us the object he contemplated was to take away the management of schools from clergymen of all denominations.

Mr. HARRISON.—We are bound to ignore it.

The BRANOR or ROSS.—If it is to be expunged I am satisfied.

21981. Mr. KAVANAGH.—You are in favour of doing away with the triennial increment and of having annual increment instead?—Yes.

21982. Has your association considered any scheme for annual increment?—Not on present inadequate grants; our idea is that the initial salary should be a fairly decent one, on which a teacher could live, and that there should be annual increment.

21983. Am you aware it is a very difficult thing, even if we were to agree that annual increment should take the place of triennial, to arrange a scheme?—You mean within the limits of the present system. I should not dream of expressing an opinion upon an actuarial question of that kind.

21984. Your Association would be satisfied with the best scheme that could be propounded for annual increments?—We would not be satisfied with the best scheme upon the present total expenditure.

3rd September, 1913.]

Mr. E. MANSFIELD examined.

[Continued.]

21924. You must see our difficulty?—I understand it.

21925. We cannot advise any further increase of salaries, therefore we must take the present amount and divide it up into annual increments?—I understand that.

21926. You have not made up any scheme yourselves?—No scheme; it is not so easily done within the limits of the present expenditure.

It will be done if the change has to be made.

21927. The Bismor or Ross.—If the expenditure cannot be increased would you attach any importance to annual increments?—Well, I think annual increments would be fairer all round.

21928. And you would prefer even with the present expenditure annual increments to triennial?—Yes. Of course, we would prefer, I need not say, to have the present expenditure increased.

21929. But if we are to recommend annual increments we must do it within the present expenditure?—We would be glad you recommended annual increments.

21930. That is on the present expenditure?—The annual would be better than the present triennial increments. Of course, you understand my point. I could not commit myself to express myself as satisfied with any scheme based on present Vote.

21931. Mr. KAVANAGH.—You are aware there might be individual hardships in carrying out such a scheme, in fact there must be?—That is that the present teachers would suffer. We could not agree.

The Bismor or Ross.—Some would gain and some would suffer. You would have a pound one way and a pound the other. One might get a pound more than under the old system and another a pound less.

Mr. HENRY.—That is in the course of a number of years.

21932. The Bismor or Ross.—Take the present teachers. There are certain stages of service if you devised a new system by which say a teacher in the fifteenth year under the new scale may gain a couple of pounds, while a teacher in the eleventh year if transferred might lose?—That is, it would give rise to the same injustice that arose in 1900.

21933. Mr. KAVANAGH.—If your members wish to revert to an annual increment we must make up a scheme that may bring some injustice?—Saying we wish to have better salaries all round it would not be quite fair to commit me to a scheme. We prefer annual increments.

21934. And if you had to choose between annual and triennial increments with the same amount, which would you choose?—With the same total sum?—

21935. Perhaps it is unfair to press you on a scheme which you have not in front of you?—I would prefer to deal with the matter in a general way.

21936. Mr. HENRY.—Take a teacher at the present time commencing at, say, £60, and assuming there is a triennial increment of £9 at the end of three years, would you prefer instead of that to have three increments of £3, so that if you got a bad report at the end of the third year you would only lose £3 instead of £9 under the old system. If it were annual increment, and his reports were good a teacher would get £3 per year, so that if he had "good" for two years he would be £6 to the good. If in the next year it was "bad," he would still have £6?—That is so.

21937. And your answer is, that even with the present expenditure you would prefer annual increment to triennial increment?—That is my answer.

21938. Mr. KAVANAGH.—You prefer the principle of annual to triennial?—Yes.

21939. You suggest doing away with the merit marks. Would you not have any merit marks at all?—I would have the general report of the school.

21940. That would be in itself a certain amount of merit?—Yes; the inspector reports on the school generally.

21941. You would not suggest giving increment without any sort of merit?—If there was serious neglect or misconduct on the part of the teacher he should not get any increment.

21942. But in the absence of gross neglect he should get increment?—Yes, as a matter of course.

21943. You were complaining that the principal of a school had no real authority over the assistant teacher?—I don't press to have a principal have very much authority over the assistant, but I certainly consider it unfair that the principal of a school should suffer if the work of the assistant is unsatisfactory.

21944. But you said yesterday that you could not give orders or suggestions?—I could give suggestions, but not orders.

21945. Supposing she refused, you could not enforce them?—No, except by making a complaint to the Board or the manager.

21946. Don't you think the principal ought to have some authority over the junior assistant, considering his merit mark and increment depend upon the efficiency of the school as a whole?—I think his mark should depend upon his own work. I should not like to express an opinion in regard to the authority the principal should have over the assistant, but seeing that the principal has no control over the appointment, I think it is unfair that he should suffer when the work of the assistant is unsatisfactory.

21947. Then you suggested the doing away altogether with the observation book?—I suggest it might be done away with. At present it is no very great help.

21948. The inspector goes away after putting his notes in the observation book, and you read them. Is not that some indication of what his report would be?—It should be, but in my own experience it is not. The notes in the observation book are sometimes trivial complaints, and I think these could be met if the inspector would discuss these matters with the teacher, and suggest to him the advisability of carrying out certain improvements. Very often teachers cannot know what the observations mean. The inspector seldom explains.

21949. Would not the manager like to see the observation book, supposing he was not present?—The inspector is supposed to write to the manager in any case.

21950. Mr. HENRY.—I wish to ask you one other question, and I would ask you to attend closely to this. In London, under the County Council, the following are the regulations for the awarding of increments:—"74 (a). Annual increments of salary according to scale are allowed for each year of satisfactory service. The annual increment falls due on the first of the month following the anniversary of the teacher's entry into service." "75 (a). The phrase 'a year of satisfactory service' means a period of twelve months during which the teacher has not been guilty of any grave misconduct. Every year counts for an increase in salary up to the maximum unless the Council decides otherwise." I want to know from you as a responsible officer of the Organisation whether such regulations as those would satisfy your Organisation as to the basis of awarding of increments?—I think it would be quite satisfactory, and the Organisation would be satisfied with such a scheme.

FORTY-SEVENTH DAY.—THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 4TH, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—Sir SAMUEL DELL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman); Most Rev. DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross; Sir HIRAM SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN COTTEY; Mr. HENRICH E. B. HARRISON, B.A.; Mr. JEREMIAH HENLY; Mr. WALTER MCMURROUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.; and Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Mr. COW MACSWINEY examined.

21951. The CHAIRMAN.—You are the representative of No. 1 District on the Central Committee of the Irish National Teachers' Organization?—Yes.

21952. Of what school are you now principal?—Aghrim, Co. Wicklow.

21953. Is that in district No. 1?—Yes.

21954. How long have you been there?—Since 1905.

21955. You were there before the introduction of the new system?—Yes.

21956. What is your present grade under the new system?—I think I must call it a kind of between grade.

I am first of first class, but the salary is not up to first of first grade. I have never been officially intimated that I belong to any grade.

21957. But you are first of first nevertheless?—Yes.

21958. To what grade under the new system would your present salary belong?—It is above the second of first, and below the first of first grade.

21959. Who are your inspectors?—Dr. Alexander and Mr. Lyman. Mr. Dickie was inspector until recently.

21960. He was junior inspector?—Yes.

21961. Who is the other junior inspector?—Mr. Lyman.

21962. There are two in each circuit?—Two in each section.

21963. Each circuit has two junior inspectors and a senior inspector?—Yes, I believe so.

21964. In circuit No. 1 you have two junior inspectors—Mr. Lyman and Mr. Dickie?—Yes, and I think Miss Burke.

21965. What exactly is her position?—I think she is a junior inspector.

21966. The Bazaar or Rose.—Mr. Lyman succeeded to Mr. Dickie in your section?—Yes.

21967. I think Mr. Lyman and Mr. Dickie are the juniors?—Yes, and Miss Burke.

21968. There are two juniors and one of them is a woman?—Yes.

21969. How long have they been in that circuit?—Mr. Lyman two years and Mr. Dickie since 1906.

21970. How long is Dr. Alexander there?—He came in 1908.

21971. Have you any statement to make about your reports in the last thirteen years?—I have nothing particular.

21972. What was your last report?—It was "good."

21973. Had you a higher report before that?—I had.

21974. For a number of years?—I went up and down. I will give you the exact thing. At the beginning of the new system, 1901, the report was "good"; in 1902, from Mr. Connolly, "good"; in 1903, Mr. Horan, "good"; in 1904, Mr. Bateman, "good"; in 1905, Mr. Bateman, "very good"; in 1906, Mr. Strong, "good."

It was a curious thing that in various schools Mr. Strong reduced the mark. In the girls' school next door, which Mr. Strong examined the same day, he reduced the mark to "fair" from "good." Mr. Strong was not in good health, but he was a very honest man.

21975. You were reduced that year from "very good" to "good," and the girls' school from "good" to "fair"?—Yes; it was the increment year, and the reduction of the report stops increment.

21976. It did not affect you?—No; I am beyond increment. The next year, 1907, Mr. Dickie first examined and gave me "good"; in 1908 it was "good"; in 1909 "good," and in 1910 I got "very good." Then Dr. Alexander came, and in 1911 I was reduced again to "good." The examination was held in October.

21977. You were reduced after that report?—Yes.

Then in 1912 I was given "good" by Mr. Lyman, and in 1913 also "good" by Mr. Lyman.

21978. Have you any personal complaint to make of the mode of inspection with regard to yourself?—No; not of Mr. Lyman, but I have of Mr. Dickie, and of his insulting manner before the children. I might be at the bottom of the school amongst the children, and Mr. Dickie would jump in and say—"Mr. —, come up here; this class knows nothing!"

21979. Have you anything more to say about your own personal career?—I don't care to say anything.

21980. The reason I ask is, that yesterday your case was mentioned along with that of Mr. Mansfield?—But I understood you to be asking about my own personal inspection.

21981. No, but with regard to your personal career, there was a case, in which you were involved, mentioned yesterday, of which I confess I hardly heard anything before?—I'll bring that out if you wish.

21982. It is a convenient time; it will not take too long?—No. But before that there was a little incident in which I was called upon to explain in connection with Rule 127 (b). If it had been introduced into my school it would have lowered my salary very considerably.

21983. I would have hit you by reducing your salary?—Oh, yes. Father Kelly, the manager, on the introduction of Rule 127 (b), wrote to the Board, and asked what would be the effect if the attendance fell below certain numbers, and he was informed if it fell below 80 my salary would be reduced to £136, and if it fell below 70 it would be reduced to £26.

My salary was consolidated at £150. I have figures to show that the average of the boys under eight years of age. Now, I didn't care to have my salary reduced to £26. I had to work very hard to get the qualification of "First of First." Well, I didn't like that, and we held a meeting, and we got up an agitation in Wicklow about this Rule 127 (b).

21984. What was the date of that agitation?—It was in 1905, as well as I remember. I found that my average would be reduced to under 80.

21985. What would be the pecuniary result of that?—The difference between £150 and £26.

21986. You would be reduced to £26?—Yes, from £150.

21987. Did that reduction take place?—No. We got up an agitation and sent the following memorial to the school managers:—"That the enforcement of Rule 127 (b) would be an intolerable interference with the rights of parents to choose a school for their children. It would have a most injurious effect on Primary education, as it is designed to place the great majority of rural schools under the control of female teachers, and to deprive the very few remaining boys' schools of the services of any but teachers of the very lowest grade. It would also prevent young men of ability from joining the teaching profession, as they could never hope to rise above third grade, save in a few town or city schools. All this would cause a serious lowering of the standard of education in our schools, and at the same time, when there are many openings for young men of education, under Poor Law, Technical, and other Boards. The recent amendments to the Rule have made it very little, if at all, less objectionable than in its original form."

21988. Was that sent to the Board?—It was, and it was signed by everybody who was anybody in the County Wicklow.

21988. That was in 1905?—Yes.

21989. What was the reply that you got?—It was a demand to the managers that we should explain ourselves. We explained and said what we meant, and we based no more on Rule 127 (h), which has never been enforced in the County.

21990. And so you did not suffer?—No.

21991. The explanation you yourself were called upon to make recently, and to which you refer in your price, comes later?—Yes.

21992. When did that explanation take place?—You could hardly call it an explanation. It arose in this way. There was a school in Dublin from which two teachers were dismissed—

21993. Were they women teachers?—Yes, and as far as I can see, they were dismissed illegally.

21994. What year?—This year. They were dismissed on the 31st March.

21995. I thought it went back farther than that?—No, they were dismissed on the 31st March, 1913.

21996. What followed then?—They appealed to the Organisation, and I, being their representative, took the matter up.

21997. Mr. HARRINGTON.—Both were in Dolphin's Barn?—Yes, they were sisters; one was principal and the other was assistant. My letter was written on the 24th May, and perhaps I had better read it:—

"SIR,—The Committee of Inquiry into the Inspection System of the Board of National Education is holding its secret sittings, and the whole system is on its trial. Yet the dismissal of teachers, as a result of that impeached system, is carried out as drastically as ever.

"The latest victims are the principal teacher and one of the assistants in the Dolphin's Barn Girls' School, Dublin. Both ladies taught in the school for thirty years with a very fair amount of success, till Dr. Alexander, the present senior inspector, took charge of the district.

"In 1909 this inspector suggested several changes in the methods of teaching and in the system of organisation employed. The suggested changes, both in method and organisation, were carried out by the teachers. Immediately the efficiency of the school, as judged by the inspectors, began to decline until, in 1912, a Miss Bourke, newly appointed to the inspectorate, described it as 'bad.' The teachers were dismissed on the 31st of March last, and their places are now filled up. On the 16th inst. the late principal got a communication from the Board to the effect that they would sanction her appointment as assistant in the Barn School. Had she known this a little earlier, she could have secured the vacant assistantship. But it is only when the place is filled that this information is given to her.

"The treatment of the assistant is even more harsh and unjust. She was admonished on a 'fair' report in 1910, though one of the Commissioners informs us that no admonition should be given on a 'fair' report. Still, this admonition is made a count in her indictment in 1912.

"The decline in the usefulness of the school, as judged by the system of inspection at present in the dock, followed the adoption of the methods and system of organisation suggested by Dr. Alexander. The teachers, having given of their best in the public service for thirty years, are not only dismissed from their positions, but are deprived of their right to the retiring gratuity to which a few more years' service would entitle them.

"The Commissioners of National Education are, jointly and severally, responsible for this thing. How are they going to make restitution to those ladies for burling them, not only out of the service, but of their right to the retiring gratuity, after thirty years' faithful service?"

21998. The CHAIRMAN.—To what paper was that addressed?—To the *Irish Independent* of the 24th May last.

21999. What followed?—On the 28th May my manager got notice from the office saying that two chief inspectors would hold an inquiry into the matter.

22000. As to what was written in that letter?—Yes, that they would hold an inquiry into the matter in the Anglin National Schools.

22001. Was that investigation held?—Yes. It was to be held at 10 o'clock on the morning of Saturday, June 7th, in the Anglin National School. The manager could not well be present on that day at 10 o'clock, as he had special business to do elsewhere, and I wrote back and asked them to have it at 12.30, in order that the manager could come down. I also indicated my desire to have a shorthand-writer and solicitor present. In reply to that I received a letter to say that they were of opinion that the purpose of the inquiry would be adequately fulfilled by a "conference between yourself and the manager and the two chief inspectors. Nevertheless, we leave it to your own discretion as to whether a solicitor and shorthand-writer should be present."

The Bureau or Ross.—Is the first notice they made a distinction between investigation and conference?

22002. The CHAIRMAN.—In the first letter it was investigated by the two chief inspectors; the letter says:—"Reverend Sir,—I am directed to inform you that the attention of the Commissioners of National Education having been called to a letter which appeared in the *Irish Independent* of the 24th inst., signed C. MacSwenny, Central Executive Committee, I.N.T.O., in which grave reflections were made upon their administration, the chief inspectors have been requested to investigate the matter, and to furnish a full report to the Board."—Mr. MacNeill had suggested that a conference would adequately fulfil the whole thing?—Yes.

22003. But at the same time he would allow you to have your own way?—Yes.

22004. When was that held?—It was held at 12.30 on the 7th June.

22005. How long did it last?—From 12.30 to 2.30.

22006. What was the procedure in that investigation?—The two chief inspectors presided; they sat at the top of the school; the school manager sat on one side of them, and in front I sat with my solicitor. I read my letter. I have the report of the whole thing, but it would take too long to read. I will give you the substance of it. Then they said that I had stated that Dr. Alexander had changed the administration and organisation of the school, and I said "yes." I said that I had written a statement that the suggested change in the administration was responsible for the decline in the school, and one of the inspectors said, "You are attacking Dr. Alexander, and charging him with inefficiency, and stating that he is doing no good for the school." I said I was attacking the system, not the man. He said, "Very well, you don't want to make a personal attack on Dr. Alexander," and I said "No," and he said, "Will you write that to the papers," and I said "Yes," and that I would express regret if the words used were capable of that interpretation.

22007. You were to insert that regret in the newspapers?—No; I think it was the explanation that was to go in. I explained that I did not mean any personal attack upon Dr. Alexander. Next, I had referred to "a" Miss Bourke having described the school as bad, he said, "Having done the decent thing about Dr. Alexander, you will write this to the paper about Miss Bourke; you know," he said, "that 'a' before the name is not right." I said, "I hereby agree to withdraw the indefinite article before Miss Bourke's name"; then he said they would not ask me to do that. Then he came to the part about "burling them out of the Service." It was clearly proved that the principal teacher, if she knew she was eligible for an assistantship, would have got it, but she was not informed of that in any way.

22008. Mr. HENRY.—Have you the letter?—Yes; I have the official document. She was dismissed on the 31st March, but on the 16th May they mended their head, and wrote to her telling her that she was eligible for an assistantship. No manager will care to take a teacher who has been dismissed, and I hold that this was "burling her out of the Service." At the inquiry Mr. MacNeill asked me, "Were you ever in

4th September, 1913.]

Mr. COO MACSWENNY examined.

[Continued.]

that school, and do you know the teachers," and I said "No." He said, "Do you know the manager personally?" and I said "No; I have never spoken to him," and he said, "Was it not a fearful thing for you to interfere in this school?"—of course, I am only judging from memory—He spent about ten minutes, I think, in that strain. Then the Parish Priest, my manager, who was sitting near me, stood up and said, "Mr. MacNeill, the manager of that school is an invalid. He is out of the country generally for five months every year. I know the school for 30 years, and I have acted practically as manager for 30 years"—he had only recently been appointed to my district—"I know these people to be good teachers. I used to be in there every day." "Well, Father Henry," said the inspector, "the fact that you were there every day would not enable you to give an unprejudiced opinion." He presented a statement to me then, so that I should sign it.

22000. The CHAIRMAN.—The deduction from that would be that a manager would be more unprejudiced the less he sees of the school?—I'll read this statement now, which came in at the very end of the investigation. One of the chief inspectors said, "I have written this, and will you sign it, and I'll send it in?" The statement was:—

"Mr. C. MACSWENNY'S STATEMENT AT INQUIRY,
7th JULY.

"The letter over my name in *Irish Daily Independent* is mine. I had not the approval of the manager of Dolphin's Barn National School for writing the letter. I am prepared to justify the letter as a whole, but I say that I never intended to make a personal attack on Dr. Alexander. I freely express my regret that the words I used can be construed as reflecting upon Dr. Alexander. I am prepared to write a letter to the Independent to that effect. I say that I had no intention whatever of making a slight upon Miss Bourke by referring to her as 'a' Miss Bourke newly appointed inspector. By the phrase, 'bumping them out of the Service,' I meant to convey that a mistake had been made; that the Commissioners should have advised Miss Connolly, when intimating the withdrawal of salary as principal, that she was still eligible to act as assistant. I did not mean to impute to the Commissioners the intention of depriving Miss Connolly of further employment.

"(Signed), C. MACSWENNY."

22001. The CHAIRMAN.—That is the statement they asked you to sign?—Yes.

22002. Did that statement go to the Board?—Yes.

22003. Mr. HARRISON.—And was sent to the papers?—Not yet. The thing is going on yet. The letter that I wrote that was to go to the Independent embodied the points about Dr. Alexander, and I sent it on. I don't suppose you want to hear that letter, but the Commissioners wrote back and said it was entirely unsatisfactory.

22004. The CHAIRMAN.—We must have that letter. That is the letter immediately after the investigation was held?—Yes, quite soon after the investigation, about a week after, I think. Here is the letter:—"In my letter to the Independent, of the 24th May, I endeavoured to lay the Dolphin's Barn case before the public generally, and before the Committee of Inquiry, in the mildest and most moderate language I could command." And I should like to say there, that in sending it off I had some presentiments that there would be trouble, and so I was extra cautious, and I read it over for my wife, and she said it was all right.

22005. The CHAIRMAN.—That was a very wise precaution?—At any rate, she could not say afterwards "I told you so." I pointed out that after a service of 34 years the teachers had been dismissed without a penny of retiring gratuity, though principal and assistant are entitled by statute to very considerable sums (vide Schedule of the Code). They were dismissed on March 31st, and on the 16th November the

principal teacher got notice from the Board that she was eligible for an assistantship in the Barn School, but the vacant assistantship had been filled up six weeks before. On May 13th my manager was informed by the Board that, as in my letter, grave reflections were made upon their administration, the chief inspectors had been directed to investigate the matter and furnish a report to the Board. At the investigation one of the chief inspectors suggested that my references in the letter to Dr. Alexander amounted to a charge of inefficiency or dishonesty. I neither made nor intended to make any such charge, and should be sorry were my words capable of being so interpreted, and I added at the end that I could quote the letter of the 24th May in full, and could add the last paragraph to this letter.

22006. The CHAIRMAN.—You are now going to read a letter of thanks in return?—Yes. It is a letter dated the 12th July, 1913:—

"Sir,—Referring to the letter from you, headed 'Dolphin's Barn Dismissals,' published by you in the *Irish Independent* of the 24th May last, and to the inquiry held by the chief inspectors on 7th June last, I am directed by the Commissioners of National Education to inform you that they had before them, at their meeting on the 8th inst., a draft letter of apology which you proposed to send to the newspaper in question (which you forwarded through one of the chief inspectors), and I am to acquaint you that the proposed letter and apology were considered quite unsatisfactory. The Commissioners directed me to send you enclosed copy of a statement that you made in the presence of the chief inspectors on the 7th ult., and they require that your apology and letter to the newspaper shall be in harmony with that statement."

22007. The CHAIRMAN.—You have read that statement already?—Yes, the statement I sent in to the Commissioners, referring to the "bumping."

22008. They required you to bring your letter into harmony with that statement. What came of that?—I wrote back and said—"I regret that the Commissioners have considered my draft letter unsatisfactory. I agreed to write to the Independent, saying that I was prepared to justify my letter as a whole, but that I never intended to make a personal attack upon Dr. Alexander, and to express regret that the words I used could be so construed. I embodied all this in my draft letter. I should be very much obliged if you would let me know what point of the letter the Commissioners consider out of harmony with the statement drawn up by the chief inspectors; and signed by me at the Inquiry of June 7th." I said I did what I was asked to do, and that I should be glad if they would tell me what else I should do. Perhaps I had better read that letter from the Board to me:—

"Referring to previous correspondence regarding the letter from you, headed 'Dolphin's Barn Dismissals,' published in the *Irish Independent* of the 24th May last, and to the inquiry held by the chiefs of inspection on the 7th June last, I am directed by the Commissioners of National Education to inform you that they had this matter before them at their last meeting, and they ordered that your letter of apology must be in accordance with your statement at the Inquiry, and to the following effect:—

And then followed copy of the statement. To that I replied as follows:—

"August 4th, 1913.

"Sir,—Part of the statement in your letter of 30th July, that I should make in my letter to the Independent, is not in accordance with what the chief inspectors agreed at the Inquiry that I should write. We agreed that I should write to the Independent to say, that while I am prepared to justify my letter as a whole, I did not mean to make a personal attack on Dr. Alexander, and to express regret that my words should be so construed; but there was not one word about making any reference in the letter either to Miss Bourke or to the Board. The chief inspectors can bear me out in this, and

the verbatim report of the Inquiry shows that no such statement was to go to the Press, and then I quoted from the report: 'Mr. O'Connor—I will put down your statement that you had no intention of slighting Miss Bourke. Mr. MacSwiney—Yes, and don't ask me to write that to the Press. Mr. O'Connor—Oh, no.'"

22018. The CHAIRMAN.—You sent that to the Board?—Yes; and on the 22nd August the Commissioners wrote again through Mr. Lemass:—

"I am directed by the Commissioners of National Education to inform you that they have under consideration your communication of the 4th August, and previous correspondence, regarding a letter from you, which was published in the *Irish Independent* of the 24th May last, under the heading 'Dolphin's Barn Dismissal,' and they have ordered that you be informed that the statement in your letter of the 4th inst., 'that while prepared to justify my letter as a whole, I did not mean to make any personal attack on Dr. Alexander, and to express regret that my words could be so construed,' will, if forwarded to the *Irish Independent*, be accepted by them. The Commissioners also direct me to request you to forward a copy of the letter of apology before it is published."

22019. That is the letter that was to be forwarded to the *Independent*?—Yes, and was as follows:—

"To the Editor of the *Daily Independent*.
Sir,—Kindly permit me to say that while prepared to justify as a whole my letter of the 24th May, I did not mean to make a personal attack upon Dr. Alexander, and should regret were my words capable of being so construed."

22020. Is that all?—That is all. I got a communication last Saturday from the Commissioners, saying if I sent this in it would be accepted.

22021. And that terminates the matter?—Yes, that terminates the matter.

22022. Did Mr. Lemass send a form of letter that you were to sign and send to the *Independent*?—Did he provide the form for you to forward?—He sent that to me, and said "your apology must be in accordance with your statement at the Inquiry, and to the following effect."

The BUREAU OF BOYS.—Did he merely quote word for word what you had written?

The CHAIRMAN.—His letter said—"Referring to previous correspondence regarding the letter from you, headed 'Dolphin's Barn Dismissal,' published in the *Irish Independent* of 24th May last, and to the Inquiry held by the chief inspectors on the 7th June last, I am directed by the Commissioners of National Education to inform you that they had this matter before them at their last meeting, and they ordered that your letter of apology must be in accordance with your statement at the Inquiry, and to the following effect."

22023. The BUREAU OF BOYS.—Read that statement?—The letter under my name in the *Irish Independent* is mine. I had not the approval of the manager of the Dolphin's Barn National School for writing the letter. I am prepared to justify the letter as a whole, but I say that I never intended to make a personal attack on Dr. Alexander. I freely express my regret that the words I used can be construed as a reflection upon Dr. Alexander. I am prepared to write a letter to the *Independent* to that effect. I say that I had no intention whatever of making a slight upon Miss Bourke by referring to her as 'a' Miss Bourke newly-appointed inspector. By the phrase, 'hurling them out of the Service,' I meant to convey that a mistake had been made; that the Commissioners should have advised Miss Connolly, when intimating the withdrawal of salary as principal, that she was still eligible to act as assistant. I did not mean to impute to the Commissioners the intention of depriving Miss Connolly of further employment."

22024. You understood the Commissioners would be prepared to accept that letter as you now read it?—Oh, yes.

22025. That letter, if I remember rightly, is exactly the draft you sent to the Commissioners in the first instance, with a few negatives left out?—With a considerable amount left out.

22026. But in that letter, suggested by Mr. Lemass as acceptable to the Commissioners, every word was as in your original letter?—Yes.

22027. They omitted some things they thought objectionable and did not want to have published, they did not add anything, but they excised some words?—I could not say; they said the letter was entirely unsatisfactory.

22028. You read the letter, and if I remember rightly, your first draft contained every word that is in the letter which Mr. Lemass said would be acceptable?—What you mean, my Lord, is the statement I signed at the Inquiry.

22029. Anything you wrote in the draft letter you intended to be published in the *Independent*, and you submitted that draft letter to the Commissioners?—Yes.

22030. They said that the draft was unsatisfactory. Now you read that draft for us?—Yes.

22031. And if I got it rightly that draft contained every word that was in the last letter you read for us, written by Mr. Lemass, and which he suggested would be satisfactory to the Commissioners; but some things were excised or struck out of your first draft?—I see a great difference between the two.

22032. Did they add anything?—No, but they cut out a good deal.

22033. Very well, we won't differ about that?—I stuck to exactly what I agreed to do, that is, that I would refer only to Dr. Alexander and nothing else. They asked me to write a good deal more, to refer to Miss Bourke, and to the manager of the Dolphin's Barn School, and to the Commissioners themselves. All these things were cut out. It was only the other thing agreed to with the inspectors that I sent to the Press. I stood out for that as well as I could.

22034. Does Miss Bourke's name appear in the draft letter sent down by Mr. Lemass, and does the appear in the revised draft letter to be sent to the paper?—She does.

22035. And in the revised draft letter to be sent to the Press?—No.

22036. Sir HENRY WHARFINGER.—Is not this the point. You read a statement to be transmitted to the Commissioners, in which you gave your attitude towards these several parties in writing, and, as I take it, you say that while you were willing to make such a statement or explanation to the Commissioners, you were not willing to send the whole of that explanation to the papers?—Exactly.

22037. I am speaking now on a matter of public procedure and discipline, and I ask why, if you considered it necessary to explain your attitude to the Commissioners in writing the letter, why should you not give the public the same explanation?—If that was needed, I am sure I would do so. But there was a sort of give and take at the Inquiry. I was prepared to go a certain distance, and the two chiefs of inspection were prepared to go a certain distance, and they agreed and said: "If you write this about Dr. Alexander to the Press, we won't ask more."

22038. You mean to say that the chiefs of inspection, holding the investigation, said you are to write this statement to the Commissioners, but it is not necessary that you should write the whole of that statement to the *Independent*?—Exactly. So I wrote down the inspectors' words.

22039. I want to have this quite clear; and they agreed that that would be satisfactory?—Yes.

22040. Do you say that you sent to the Commissioners a statement carrying out the agreement with the inspectors, but the Commissioners were not satisfied, although what you proposed to write was in accordance with the understanding come to with the inspectors?—I think what I wrote was in accordance with the understanding come to with the inspectors, but the Commissioners were not satisfied with it.

22041. I may have been mistaken, but it certainly struck me that what you proposed to write to the *Independent* was not in accordance, in any possible

way, with the understanding arrived at with the inspectors. Will you read again what it was that your first draft contained that you sent up to the Commissioners to be written to the "Independent"?—You want me to read what I consented to send to the Commissioners?

22042. You sent the Commissioners a draft of what you proposed to insert in the "Independent"?—That is the first letter?

22043. Yes, I would like to know what you proposed to insert?—The first thing was that I would stand by every word. In my letter to the "Independent" of the 24th May, I said I endeavoured to lay the Dublin's Burn case before the public generally, but especially before the Committee of Inquiry, in the mildest and most moderate language I could command. I pointed out that after a service of 34 years the teachers had been dismissed without a penny of retiring gratuity, though both principal and assistant are entitled by service to very considerable sums. I said they were dismissed on March 31st, and on the 10th May, the principal teacher got notice from the Board that she was eligible for an assistantship in the Burn School, but the vacant assistantship had been filled up six weeks before; and I said that on the 31st May my manager was informed by the Board that as in my letter grave reflections were made upon their administration, the chief inspectors had been directed to investigate the matter, and furnish a report to the Board. At the investigation one of the chief inspectors suggested that my reference in the letter to Dr. Alexander amounted to a charge of inefficiency or dishonesty. I neither made or intended to make any such charge. I should be sorry were my words capable of being so interpreted.

22044. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Do you consider that letter a fulfilment of your undertaking to the chief inspectors?—I do.

22045. Then I regret very much that that attitude should be taken up by any man serving under any Board. Do you not consider that to repeat again the statement to which you were calling attention was a new grievance; that all you had got to do was to express shortly in that letter that you were not reflecting on Dr. Alexander, and are you surprised at the Commissioners' objecting to your repeating the whole charge and then qualifying it?—I was rather surprised, and for this reason. An agreement was signed stating that I was prepared to justify my letter as a whole.

22046. You wanted to write a letter to the "Independent" saying that while prepared to justify your letter as a whole, you were not reflecting on Dr. Alexander?—That is what it comes to in the end.

22047. And the Commissioners I should say—and I want to tell you this, because I am there in on the part of a great many of the teachers a tendency to the use of language which is wholly inadmissible in referring to a Board under which they are serving, and which would not be tolerated in any Department of the Public Service—were not satisfied. We are endeavouring to meet any hardship you may suffer, and I think it only right to point out to the teachers that they are not acting in their own best interest in using language that would not be permitted in the Public Service in any other Department. I call attention to that in your interest, and in the interest of the whole of the teachers. Men make mistakes, but they should try and meet them manfully, and I hope the teachers will do the same, otherwise they would fail to appreciate their proper position in dealing with matters of this kind?—Well, if I erred in one way, the Commissioners went as far another way, because they asked me to write a good many things that I did not undertake to write at all.

22048. The CHAIRMAN.—I think the incident may end here?—I am sorry this thing cropped up at all, because it is my own case.

22049. Your case was brought up yesterday and I, for one, was imperfectly informed, and I thought it right to ask you these things, and to see how your case compared with the case of Mr. Mansfield. I will ask you now to proceed with your general statement?—Very well. In 1911 and 1912 some cases of

dismissal and lowering of reports likely to lead to disrepute were brought under my notice as the representative of District I on the Central Executive Committee of the Irish National Teachers' Organisation. Teachers as a rule are very reticent in regard to their troubles about lowered reports, threats of dismissal, or reprimands, and very seldom lay their cases before the Organisation till too late, till notice of dismissal has been issued, or even till the dismissal has taken effect. The Central Executive Committee passed the following resolution in May, 1912:—"That, as the number of dismissals appears to be alarmingly on the increase, each member of the Central Executive Committee is hereby requested to collect information in all cases of actual or threatened dismissal in his own district and to report to the Central Executive Committee at next meeting, with a view to concerted action." On the 27th May, the same year, I published the following letter in the "Irish School Weekly":—"Dismissals and coloured resignations for inefficiency are becoming alarmingly frequent, and it is to be noticed that these follow in the track of curates, happily only a few, inspectors. Inefficient inspectors make inefficient schools. It is done in this way: one of them comes into a school conducted by a mistress, hectors about and makes nasty disparaging remarks in the presence of the pupils. Word goes out that the inspector has found fault with the school. The parents get to hear of it. The matter is talked about at home. The teacher loses the confidence of the children and the parents, and firstly loses confidence in herself. The attendance becomes more and more irregular. Any excuse is good enough, and when the senior inspector comes round after a few years he finds teachers and pupils demoralised. The manager sees the bad reports, listens to the inspector's complaints, and wonders how school teachers, so efficient a few years before, should have fallen so low. He consents, or gives only feeble opposition to the dismissal. The teacher, too much ashamed to tell anybody, or telling all too late, goes away and suffers, as if he or she were to blame, in silence, just as a wounded animal will creep into any little hole to die unnoticed. Men do not lose the confidence of the pupils so readily through official hectoring, and accordingly we find that mistresses of from fifteen to thirty years' service are the chief sufferers from this class of inefficiency, which has followed so surely in the wake of a few misdeeds of inspectors. Teachers affected, or likely to be affected, should communicate at once with their district representatives. This demoralization of teachers and pupils of whole districts by official incapacity must be put a stop to, preferably by our own Department, the Board of National Education, or failing this, by Parliamentary action." The following resolution was passed at a meeting of the Co. Wicklow Teachers' Organisation on June 15th, 1912, and a copy forwarded to the Commissioners:—"That as the alarming increase in dismissals and withdrawals of salary for alleged inefficiency has produced among the teachers of this district a feeling of insecurity amounting almost to consternation, we request the Commissioners of National Education to withdraw salary from no teacher without an investigation by some authority independent of the inspectors in charge of the district, and at which the opinion of the local authorities, manager and parents, will have due weight."

22050. What were you contemplating at that time? Some authority independent of the inspectors?—We were contemplating some other system of inspection than that then in force.

22051. Mr. HADDOCK.—Independent of the inspectors in charge of the districts?—Yes, that is what was in our minds.

22052. Would it not be better to name some definite authority?—We started the late to be hunted down after, when things were put in train.

22053. The CHAIRMAN.—Do I understand you and your organization to mean that in the case of appeals you would leave many of these appeals to the chiefs of inspection, because you are constantly talking about appeals not being really heard?—I scarcely think we would.

22051a. You see my point; to whom is the appeal to go?—Before 1900 we had an appeal.

22052. To whom did you appeal?—To the Office, and a head inspector was sent down. He examined, and the result was generally satisfactory to the teacher. The teacher felt there was justice, and there was no complaint. We accepted that at the time.

22053a.—The BISHOP or ROSS.—Were they sent down on the occasion of every appeal sent to the office, and of every complaint?—As far as I know—I did not take much interest in the organisation then—they were.

22053. Of course, you don't know what number of complaints went in?—No; but what I do know is there was general satisfaction with the system. At present I could not say an appeal to the chief inspector would give satisfaction, because a lot of doubt has crept into the minds of the teachers recently. We are in fear and terror of our lives, and we have no confidence in our Department.

22054. Except the chief inspectors, to whom should the appeal go?—To the Office, certainly, and that is why we would be inclined to accept the old system.

The CHAIRMAN.—But I thought you would not accept the decision of the office?

Mr. HENRY.—What he means is his application would go to the office.

22055. The CHAIRMAN.—Yes; but it would not end with the office?—Just as I have explained, we have lost confidence in the office. I am pretty sure we would accept the chief inspectors; but we think the manager of the school, who knows something about it, should have something to say also, provided the manager was not an interested party, that is, should not have brought on the inquiry, in which case we would accept a manager nominated by the Bishop.

22056. You go this far. You would accept the chief inspector sitting along with the manager, and some others of the locality?—I would leave the locality out of it. Speaking for myself, I believe we would accept an appeal to the chiefs of inspection.

22057. You never once mentioned the Board as a first court of appeal?—And designedly so, and I'll tell you why presently.

22058. Will you tell us now?—I have a great many cases of dismissal here. All these, before sentence is finally passed, have the option of appealing to the Board, and they have done so, and in a single case with success. Further, we have what is called the Maynooth Resolution—

22059. You say these cases were taken to the Board, and were actually heard by the Board?—I cannot tell whether they were heard; but the teachers sent in their appeals.

22060. You cannot tell whether they were heard or not?—I cannot. These appeals to the Board have been, so far as I know, absolutely without effect. Now we have an appeal to the Bishops. I have been representative on a good many appeals against dismissals. I have appealed to the Commissioners and begged them to do something. These were four appeals made to me against dismissals by managers. One was in the arch-diocese of Armagh, two in the diocese of Ely, and one in the diocese of Exeter. All the four cases were settled to the satisfaction of Teachers' Organisation and the clerical authorities.

22061. The Bishop had the hearing of the case?—Yes, that is the difference between an appeal to the Bishops, of which we know something, and an appeal to the Board, of which we know nothing.

22062. That surprises me, because we have heard so much about an appeal to the Board. Now you seem to drop the Board altogether?—I have given my reason.

22063. You think the proper court of appeal would be the chief inspector, sitting with somebody else?—Speaking for myself, I say with the manager of the school, provided he was not involved in the dispute, if he is, then some other manager nominated by the Bishop; that is my own opinion.

22064. You are not speaking for the Organisation in that?—I think I am speaking the general view of those who have considered the matter.

22065. Mr. CORRIE.—Do you move appeals against the mark of the inspector when you say that the chief inspector and manager are both to investigate?—I mean an appeal against any charge brought against the teacher.

22066. Any charge?—Yes, affecting his school paper, or any charge against himself.

22067. The CHAIRMAN.—There would be a great many appeals on the question of inefficiency that would not involve dismissal?—No; but they would involve a serious penalty.

22068. Mr. HANCOCK.—Appeals are mainly because of reports of inefficiency?—Yes, mainly; but generally they would be in regard to cases involving serious penalty.

22069. The CHAIRMAN.—I was not referring to the mark at all?—Nor did I take it so.

22070. Mr. CORRIE.—In any case of the inefficiency of the teacher to discharge his duty to the pupils, can you conceive that any other authority could be a court of appeal except the Commissioners of National Education and their officers?—Oh, I suppose there could be.

22071. How could the manager in many cases judge of the efficiency or inefficiency of the teacher; he is outside the machinery of inspection?—If the manager carries out his work, he is very often in the school, and has opportunities of judging. Any manager I ever had was such, and the manager I have at present scarcely ever misses a day.

22072. That is a particular case; but taking the managers as a whole, do you think they would be ready to offer an opinion as to the efficiency of the school, or could do so as well as a State Department?—I don't think they should be called upon to interfere in small cases, such as lowering a report from "good" to "fair," and that kind of thing, I don't think they should be called upon to do that.

22073. If the teacher is inefficient, the manager has the machinery to get rid of him. Why then should the manager come in as a court of appeal, sitting side by side with the inspector, as to the efficiency or the inefficiency of the teacher?—You mean as to lowering of reports?

22074. I mean on the question of efficiency?—How far would that enter?

22075. Involving dismissal?—Then I think the manager should have the opportunity.

22076. Doesn't the manager, so to say, cut himself free of any right to interfere by the fact that he retains a teacher in his service who is inefficient?—I am not responsible for an anomaly of that sort. I grant that the manager might not be competent to draw a fine distinction between "excellent," "good," and so on; but at the same time on grave matters regarding the efficiency or inefficiency of the school, I think the manager, who is on the ground, is a very good judge.

22077. I am not questioning that; but I don't see how you can have official machinery and non-official machinery mixed up with the question of efficiency. The very fact that the manager has power to get rid of the teacher, but retains him there, would certainly suggest that, sitting at the inquiry with the chief inspector, they would not make quite an impartial tribunal?—Well, of course, the teacher can be dismissed by either, he is between two millstones.

My view is that since there is a question of efficiency or inefficiency, it is a public department by official machinery, such as the chief inspectors, that should decide. That is all I wanted to ask, because I was not clear what you meant by having the manager coupled with the chief inspector.

22078. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, Mr. MacSwanev, will you refer to the cases that you are going to bring before us. I think you recognise yourself, from what you say to me, that we cannot investigate these things judicially at this table. You bring them before us, I presume, as illustrations of some main contentions by you and your Association, not that we should go judicially into an investigation of these things, so we will go over them rapidly with that view?—Very well, sir. I am entirely in your hands.

22070. I want you to tell us the particular conclusions you wish to deduce from the consideration of these cases—I should like to read the teachers' own statements in a few of those cases, probably a sample of two will do.

22080. You refer in your proofs to the provisions of Rule 90 (4) and to some instances of dismissals in Circuit 12. Where is Circuit 12? Part of Dublin, Wexford and some of Kildare and the County Wicklow. The first case I mention is Red Cross, County Wicklow.—The teacher was Miss Callan, and the manager Father Nolan, P.P., Ovoca Parish. The manager appealed against this dismissal without any effect.

Can you tell us what the procedure was in these cases, because they seem to be very much alike?

22081. Mr. CONNELL.—In that case of Red Cross, the manager appealed?—Yes. First the teacher is dismissed; that if she does not improve her salary will be withdrawn, then the inspector comes along and inspects the school.

22082. Which inspector?—The senior inspector. He inspects the school, and in none of these cases of dismissal has there been examination.

THE CHAIRMAN.—You have no evidence of any detailed examination?—

22083. Mr. CONNELL.—That detailed examination is provided for, is it not, under the rules?—Yes, Rule 90.

22084. What followed the report of the senior inspector?—He sends in a report, the teacher is informed that salary will be withdrawn on a certain date, but before it is withdrawn she has a right to make any explanation she wishes to the Commissioners.

22085. THE CHAIRMAN.—That is through the manager?—Yes.

22086. She can do it directly now?—Probably, but it is made through the manager as a rule, and then the salary is withdrawn.

22087. There is no appeal to any higher officer, but according to the rule there is?—Rule 90 (4) says, "In no case is a teacher dismissed for inefficiency on the reports of a single inspector; before recognition is finally withdrawn, his work is tested by means of a thorough inspection of the school as a whole, and an examination of all the standards, for whose instruction the teacher is responsible."

22088. The inspection is conducted by one of the senior or head inspectors, and in the presence of one of the Commissioners if they think it desirable. That was not done in this case?—No. I have proof that there was nothing but inspection, and I'll read some of these documents which I have, which prove that there was only inspection.

22089. It is provided that this inspection is conducted by one of the senior or chief inspectors in the presence of one of the Commissioners if they think it desirable. Your statement is not entirely satisfactory. You have given it in a negative way, but have you any proof?—I have.

22090. THE BISHOP OF ROSS.—Did you ask the teachers, and did they positively state that there was no examination?—Every teacher positively stated that there was no examination, but beside that, I have reports of every case.

22091. THE CHAIRMAN.—We want absolute proof of that statement. Can you quote any document referring to the Red Cross case?—I have no document except the bare statement, because that teacher, Miss Callan, was dismissed some time ago, but I can take the next one, the Barmahy school.

22092. The manager there was Father Nolan, and the teacher was Miss Mary Kehoe. She was trained in 1905, and, according to your statement, did what every inspector directed as to method, and handwriting, what is the meaning of that?—It is this: The inspector, Mr. Dickie, who was over her, adopted a certain style of headlines, which was the upright style, she didn't like to adopt this in the whole school, she did it in the junior classes, but left the old style stand in the senior. The next time the inspector's report was adverse, owing to the fact that there were two styles of penmanship in the school.

22093. You say that that is a case of inspector-made inefficiency?—Yes.

22094. Have you got a report, or any document to show how that school was treated on inspection?—The senior inspector has now furnished a report of the special inspection of the school, held on the 29th June, 1912, the following are the essential passages:—

"This school is not conducted with either method or earnestness of purpose. The teacher does her work in a half-hearted way, and makes no proper preparation for her duties. She does not even attempt to carry out, in detail, the arrangements on her own time-table. The infants were kept sitting from 10 a.m. to 12.35 p.m., and during the whole of that time did not receive a single lesson from the teacher in any subject. From 10 to 10.30 they were supposed to be writing, but they simply scribbled on slates without any guide lines. They were kept at the same occupation from 10.30 to 11—that is, they scribbled for an hour—though the work set down for them on the time-table was 'tables' (10.30 to 11). From 11 to 11.30 they were supposed to be writing, but they were put to (so-called) stick-laying instead. A wholly unsuitable 'plan' was drawn on the blackboard, and they then left to their own devices. Subsequently the teacher discovered the unsuitability of this 'plan' and substituted another. The infants were kept at this work during the next half hour; that is, they were occupied for an hour of stick-laying (i.e., idling), during which time they received no guidance whatever from the teacher. From 12 to 12.30 they should have been engaged at writing, according to the time-table, but they were supplied with small coloured beads with which they amused themselves during the half hour. The children received no teaching or guidance of any kind. Miss Kehoe gave an object lesson on 'bee hives' to the senior pupils. It was merely an aimless talk about them, based on a lesson in a Nature Reader, no teaching notes drawn up by herself were used. I asked her if she had any; after a search she produced a somewhat ancient document (written by herself), but she made no use of it. I tested the pupils in fourth and higher standards in arithmetic and found them very backward; no attempt, apparently, had been made by the teacher to train them to reason. They were quite unable to solve any question that made a demand on their thinking powers."

22095. THE CHAIRMAN.—What was the age of these children who had to reason and exercise their thinking powers?—Three and four, and in the higher standards from nine to twelve. "The instruction in grammar is characterised by a want of intelligence; it consists merely of a string of technicalities which are very imperfectly understood by the pupils. Home lessons are badly prepared, and the teacher does not take any decided steps to effect an improvement. No record of the lessons set or the answering in them is kept. The pupils answer in an indistinct, mumbling tone, and the teacher makes no effort to train them to speak with clearness and firmness. According to the particulars given in the weekly syllabus of proposed work the whole of this week was to be devoted to the annual examination for promotion; the only written work (which is attached to this report) consisted of a few sheets of arithmetical exercises, although my inspection was held on Friday, the last day of the examination. It is clear that no real attempt was made to test the fitness of the pupils for promotion and that this most important duty had received very perfunctory attention. The written exercises of the pupils (done during the year) are, moreover, not at all corrected with sufficient thoroughness. The pupils of this school are receiving a very imperfect education, and I see no prospect of an improvement while the present teacher remains in charge of it."

22096. Mr. HARRISON.—Was that the final report which led to her dismissal?—It was.

THE CHAIRMAN.—That is the one ordered under Rule 90, section 4.

22097. Mr. HARRISON.—The first part of that report is concerned almost entirely with the junior class, the infants?—Evidently.

22098. Is it usual in Ireland to examine the infants at all?—It is generally done. The inspector hears them read and gets them to answer little simple questions, and sets them little writing exercises, and looks through the work.

22100. It appears that he inspected the school, and at any rate did not examine the junior children?—Evidently.

22101. At the same time, that report is a very heavy indictment of the teacher in charge of these little children?—Yes.

22102. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—How many teachers are there in that school?—One, I think.

22103. Mr. KAVANAGH.—How many children in the school?—Thirty children of all ages from three to twelve or thirteen.

22104. Mr. HUSLEY.—And of all classes?—Yes.

22105. Mr. HARRISON.—Is there any evidence that any of the older children were subjected to any sort of examination such as contemplated in Rule 90?—There is not the slightest evidence, except that he says "I tested the pupils in fourth and higher standards in arithmetic, and found them very backward. No attempt apparently has been made by the teacher to train them to reason."

22106. That applies to arithmetic?—Yes.

22107. Is there any evidence that they were examined in reading?—No.

22108. Is there any evidence that any tests were set in reading, writing or composition?—None whatever.

22109. Is there any evidence that there was any oral examination in such subjects as geography or history?—Not a word about history or geography.

22110. Geography would be certain to be on the programme?—Yes.

22111. And history?—Yes.

22112. There is some little reference to grammar?—Yes.

22113. So that, as far as the report goes, it is only in arithmetic and grammar that article 93 can be said to have been complied with?—Yes.

22114. So far as there is evidence in the report?—Yes.

22115. Mr. HUSLEY.—The evidence of the report would prove he was testing rather what the teacher's work was?—Having read the outline of the inspector's side of the question, may I give teacher's side? I have it in writing.

22116. Mr. COSWAY.—Did the manager make an appeal in that case?—Yes, I'll come to that.

22117. The CHAIRMAN.—Read what the teacher says?—Roll No. 2301—class A.—I took up duty in above school in 1904, and was deprived of my Training Diploma in 1909 because of low marking. During these years and since I have been a victim of harsh and unjust inspectors. From the first day Mr. Dickie entered my school he seemed to make up his mind that I should be ground down. When he arrived, hot and irritable after pushing a bicycle up a steep hill, almost his first remark was, "I don't know why they stick a school up on a mountain like this." His ill humor resulted on my unfortunate head. I have always found him tyrannical and unreasonable, giving an order at one visit, and at the next asserting me he never meant any such thing. My senior pupils especially have been repeatedly praised by various visitors who visited the school. They have often declared that they never met better taught children. Five who went to secondary schools received the highest credit. On one occasion a girl answered Mr. Dickie so well that he turned to me, and asked in a sneering tone before the class, "Is she a new pupil?" (It so happened that the child never had any other teacher.) Another girl, equally good, so irritated Dr. Alexander by her intelligence that he took an opportunity, behind my back, of saying to her, "A girl like you should be out earning, not wasting her time coming to school." The child was not quite 13, and when Inspector had gone she cited history, telling me what he said, for she had expected some appreciation and encouragement. Her father was so indignant that he would have reported Dr. Alexander but for me. She is Alice Barry, Balkinhill, Arklow. I wish to draw special attention to examination of January, 1912. Mr. Dickie notified manager that he would examine my school on the 11th. Instead, without any notice, he came and examined on 10th. I was myself rather surprised to see pupils

doing so well just after vacation. Even Inspector grudgingly admitted there was improvement and he might raise mark, and noted general improvement in observation book. In examining third standard arithmetic he ordered me to give them slates. I told the pupils to produce jotters. He insisted on slates. When slates were worked he pronounced them wrong. I had been looking over pupils' shoulders, and insisted they were right. I asked him to look again. He did so, and reluctantly admitted he was mistaken, ordered pupils to clean slates; then wrote down arithmetic very deficient. Three months after this report arrived marked "middling." Although it admitted general improvement and advance in most subjects, it was accompanied a reprimand and threat that if an improvement was not noticed by head inspector, who would visit in three months, salary would be withdrawn. The latter gentleman came in June, and from the first I saw his mind was made up to ruin me. He never said 'good morning,' and even the children said he was 'very cross.' As I saw his intention in his face I felt positively incapable of action. No matter what I did I saw disapproval. Father Purfield, who was present part of time, can corroborate my statement. Three months later his report came, and an opportunity offered by Board to manager and me to explain my inefficiency. We returned an explanation, and have heard nothing since."

22118. Mr. COSWAY.—Is she a young woman?—About twenty-seven.

22119. Mr. HARRISON.—You read the first part so quickly that I did not catch what her qualifications were. Was she trained before she came to that school?—It was her first school, but I believe she had a good record.

22120. What was it?—I could not tell.

22121. That is her own version?—Yes.

22122. She does not give chapter and verse. This was her first school?—Yes, she took up duty in 1904.

22123. And when was she finally condemned?—In 1912.

22124. Had she ever had a decent report?—Her first report was "fair."

22125. What did she do after that?—She got "fair" again; it was reduced to "middling" in 1909, in 1910 she got "fair," in 1912, "middling," and then she was dismissed.

22126. Of course, "middling" is a bad mark?—Yes.

22127. And "fair" is a very poor mark?—Well, no. The CHAIRMAN.—We were told it was looked upon as "indifferent."

22128. The BRUCE or BONE.—She did not get her diploma till 1909?—She didn't get her diploma at all. Perhaps now you would hear outside evidence in connection with this case.

22129. Mr. HARRISON.—Take a sample, and a sample only?—Yes, I'll give the manager's view. The manager lives at the other side of the parish, this school is on the borders of Arklow, and a curate looks after it, and I have a letter from the curate.

The CHAIRMAN.—I have grave doubts whether this kind of evidence is permissible. I don't think it would justify any conclusion, otherwise you might appeal to the parish and get a vote.

22130. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—I think if we took a sample?—This is the evidence of the virtual manager of the school.

22131. Mr. COSWAY.—Have you got a copy of the appeal the manager made to the Board?—No, the only thing I want to show is *causa* why sentence should not be passed.

22132. The CHAIRMAN.—This is what the curate says?—Yes, he was the virtual manager, and he says:—"Dr. Alexander paid a visit to Barnanisk National School on the 28th June, where he informed me that the teaching was deficient. I do not know what report he may have given to the Board, but I think I am justified in calling the Board's attention to some few matters which require consideration. Dr. Alexander complained to me then and there that the teaching was inefficient, and he drew his conclusion after a few hours' inspection. I do not think it is fair to Miss Kehoe (or any other teacher) that she

should be branded as incompetent without taking into account circumstances which are as essential, and the omission of which would seriously injure a teacher's reputation. Now, on the day of Dr. Alexander's visit the following facts should be borne in mind, and should be embodied in the inspector's report:—Miss Kehoe is of a slightly nervous disposition, and knowing the seriousness of the trial she was undergoing, she was, as is natural to expect, somewhat confused and excited at the time. I stated this fact to the inspector, but he misread my statement, in fact, contradicted me. I did not press the matter further, but I asked the Board to decide—who is the better judge? One who meets the teacher frequently during each week, or one whose visits are few and far between? Some of Miss Kehoe's best pupils were absent—and a cogent reason was given. In Berransky school the average is 27 or 28. There are eight standards and one teacher. The inspector complained that some of the infants were idle for a time. Is Miss Kehoe ubiquitous? Besides infant children will sit in spite of any teacher. Miss Kehoe put a drawing on the board, and realising it was difficult, she immediately replaced it by one simpler in construction. The inspector made a note of this, and why I fail to see. If the teacher insisted on the children drawing the first figure then there might be some reason for the note. The parents of the children are satisfied, and, I may add, if their children were neglected I would soon be informed. One child had not her book with her, and whether the inspector accepted Miss Kehoe's explanation or not I cannot say, but I am told he spoke to the child afterwards re the matter, which would leave one to infer that he doubted the explanation. Contrary to the inspector's report of inefficiency, I wish to draw the Board's attention to the 'excellent' report in the religious examination of that school. Now, I think, if the foregoing facts were mingled through the inspector's notes the report would be of a very mild type indeed. Teachers have much to contend with, and there seems to be a lack of sympathy with them in their arduous task. Miss Kehoe does not deserve an unfavourable report. She is most attentive, and I cannot conclude without protesting against reports made to the Board, while at the same time circumstances of the utmost importance are being excluded." And then he continued:—"To the above I would like to add one or two points. In my opinion, Miss Kehoe—like the man with the axe—is trying to please all pleased men. Each inspector has a method of his own, and I believe no two inspectors agree in this respect. Is it a fact that one inspector leans to interfere with the other's remarks entered? Miss Kehoe should give you full particulars about the inspector's remarks to a child named Alice D'Arcy. She mentioned this to me, but I think it is Miss Kehoe's place to give prominence to what passed."

22132. The CHAIRMAN.—I must ask how can we go into all this, and how can we admit these remarks of little children?—I am in your hands.

22133. Mr. COFFEY.—Was Mr. Dickie the inspector?—He was the junior inspector.

The CHAIRMAN.—What I suggest is, that, with the consent of the Committee, you might bring out the point in each of these cases, as to the procedure of the Board, but an investigation of each is quite impossible.

22134. Mr. COFFEY.—Had she any other inspector?—Yes; Dr. Roteman.

22135. What was his mark?—"Fair" was the highest. She came out at a time when each of the inspectors began his own methods as to teaching, as I will show you, and this poor girl tried to do what one inspector told her, and was reprimanded by another.

22136. The CHAIRMAN.—May I draw your attention to the case of "Miss Nora Mullins, Glenally National School? Her report was lowered from 'fair' to 'muddling' after a visit by Dr. Starke"—what does that mean?—What it says, that after Dr. Starke visited the report was lowered. I'll run very quickly through the circumstances in her case. She was trained in Baggot Street, and got First of Second,

and got her diploma. She was threatened with dismissal, and now is actually dismissed. Her reports were as follows:—In 1904, "bad," Mr. Dickie, that was on the occasion of her first appointment; in 1905, "good," Mr. Dickie; in 1906, "fair," Mr. Strong; in 1907, "fair," Mr. Cussen; in 1908, "fair," Mr. Cussen; in 1909, "muddling," Dr. Alexander; in 1910, "muddling," Mr. Lyman; in 1911, "muddling," Mr. Lyman.

22137. The CHAIRMAN.—Is that the last?—Yes, the report was lowered from "fair" to "muddling."

22138. Dr. Starke visited in 1908?—Yes, and at the next examination the report was lowered from "fair" to "muddling."

22139. That seems to suggest a certain conclusion. Have you any ground for that conclusion?—None whatever, except that I have two other cases where the report was similarly lowered.

22140. It may be a mere coincidence?—Yes.

Mr. COFFEY.—In this case there never was a good report except one.

22141. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—And that was given by Mr. Dickie?—Yes.

22142. The CHAIRMAN.—We have to consider the character of the evidence. Now as to the suggestion that Dr. Starke by his presence contributed to the lowering of the mark from "fair" to "muddling," I ask is there any evidence whatever to support that?—None whatever; but the lowering followed his visit.

22143. Do you think it fair to produce it then?—I don't think it unfair. We have two other cases.

22144. A long series of coincidences might suggest that Dr. Starke's visits did lower the reports, but surely not a single case?—I have two other cases, one is from Roskilde, and the teacher, Miss Harrison; and the other is the Ballaghkeena National School, and the teacher Mrs. Manning.

22145. Will you read Miss Harrison's case?—It was merely a lowering of report, and not dismissal.

22146. But you said it is a case where the lowering of the report followed a visit by Dr. Starke. Have you the record of that teacher's reports for some years?—Yes.

That will tell us something.

22147. Mr. COFFEY.—Let us have the reports?—In 1906 she was at Danganrath National School, and her reports were "good," "excellent," "very good," and "very good."

22148. The CHAIRMAN.—That brings her down to 1906?—Yes.

22149. What were her reports then?—In Roskilde her first report was "good" in 1907; in 1908, "fair"; in 1909, "fair"; in 1910 there was no inspection, in the next year she got "fair," and in 1912 "good."

22150. The CHAIRMAN.—In which of the years did Dr. Starke's visit occur?—In 1908.

22151. And was the report lowered on that year?—Yes, it fell from "good" to "fair."

22152. And that was the year of Dr. Starke's visit, and you mean the same inference to be drawn?—She says that owing to this report she has lost £24, and she has made a long statement.

22153. Can you give us the particulars of that statement. In what month did Dr. Starke visit the school?—Dr. Starke visited the school in June, 1908. The statement is rather a long one. She also charges rudeness against Mr. Dickie.

22154. When did the inspector visit for the general report?—The annual inspection was on the 26th September, just three months after.

22155. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—Not in the same school-year?—The very same year for the report.

22156. I thought the school-year began in July?—Yes, but you are examined any time during the year.

22157. During what year? The calendar or the school-year?—For the year. You can be examined any time.

22158. The statement is that Dr. Starke visited the same year as the report was lowered. Dr. Starke visited during one school-year, and the inspector for another school-year?—The previous report was for 1907.

22159. The CHAIRMAN.—I think we may pass on to the other cases?—The Ballaghkeena National School case.

22180. Yes, the teacher is Mrs. Manning. Can you give us her reports?—I think that previous to 1900 she was an assistant; her reports were "very good." In 1900 it was "good." Dr. Starkie visited before this report, with Mrs. Starkie, and the report was lowered next examination to "fair."

22181. Then Dr. Alexander visited in July, 1912?—That was an incidental visit.

22182. Is there no mark following "fair" in 1910?—No, there was no action taken upon that. It is a peculiar case, and I would be very glad you would hear it. When Dr. Alexander visited on July 23rd, there were only ten pupils in Mrs. Manning's class, and all were wet and cold, as the day was very wet and wild. Dr. Alexander came to the door of the room where she taught, and only for five minutes at a time, yet as the result of those peeps at her work, he reported to the Board:—"The assistant, Mrs. Manning, is almost wholly useless." As a result of Dr. Alexander's report, she was threatened with dismissal, the Board sent word that Dr. Alexander would examine in December to see whether her services could be retained; he came in December, and examined the school from 10 till 5, and he said the school was very much improved, and he remarked to Mrs. Manning, "You have shown me to-day that you know how to teach, and can teach, and have taught," thus this teacher, from being almost useless, became highly efficient, but this Commission of Inquiry had been granted in the meantime. Before this Commission, teachers were dismissed from schools without a final examination, now things are changed.

22183. The BRONOR or ROSS.—What about the Dolphin's Barn case?—The final examination was before that time, just as it was in other cases I have mentioned. There were several other cases of teachers threatened with dismissal, there was the case of Mrs. Byrne, and Mrs. Carroll, and a good many others. They were threatened that there was to be an examination, and when it was held there was a decided improvement, as in the case of Mrs. Manning, and if you take this as a type of teacher whose school has improved, probably you can dispose of this. She has had 10 years' service. Her reports up to 1909 were "very good"; in 1909, "good"; 1910, "fair"; 1911, "fair"; 1912, "fair." She says herself, "I always, as far as I am aware, gave satisfaction in my capacity as a teacher. When Dr. Alexander visited the school on July 23rd it was an extremely wet day; only 10 children present, all of them wet and cold. Dr. Alexander only looked into the classroom for a very short time on this wet day, with shivering infants, yet I am to be dismissed in December if I do not please the same inspector. I appealed to the Board, and was told that before being dismissed the school would be examined again. Mr. Dickie visited the school on October the 10th last and advised me to retire from the service, that I was fairly well off, and that there was no use sticking on. Whereas if I retired from the service my pension would not be enough to support me. On the 18th December Dr. Alexander held a special examination and expressed himself pleased with the improvement in my school, and I hope to be able to continue my profession of teaching without any further unpleasant experience."

22184. The CHAIRMAN.—This was the examination which ended in her being reinstated?—Which ended in the notice being withdrawn.

22185. Mr. HARRISON.—Just one small point. The Dolphin's Barn case was decided after this Committee was appointed?—I don't think so.

22186. The BRONOR or ROSS.—The dismissal was in June of this year, was it not?—There is a little difference here, because the examination on which the dismissal took place was held the year before. The dismissal took place on the 11th March this year, and the examination on which that dismissal took place a year before. If you will let me I will read a list of dismissals or threatened dismissals:—Miss Callen, Red Cross, Co. Wicklow; Miss Kehoe, Barryscry, Co. Wicklow; Mrs. Earl, Carrigrohane, Co. Wicklow; Miss Mullins, Glenasy, Co. Wicklow; Mr. Hunt, Trooperstown, Co. Wicklow; Mr. O'Mahony, Oligate, Co. Wexford; Mr. Hicks, Riverchapel, Co. Wexford; Mr. Collins, Clonroche, Co. Wexford; Mr. Lambert, Clonroche, Co. Wexford; Mr. Wells, Ferns, Co. Wex-

ford; Mr. Murphy, Crawford, Co. Wexford; Mr. Walsh, Glina, Co. Wexford; Mr. Moriarty, Wicklow. Mr. Moriarty was professor in the Diocesan College, Ennis. Mrs. Manning's notice is withdrawn, as I stated.

22187. What is the period between which these dismissals took place?—Miss Callen's was in 1921.

22188. Mr. HENLY.—What was the earliest?—1905.

22189. The CHAIRMAN.—What was the date of the last?—June this year.

22190. The BRONOR or ROSS.—That is from 1905 to 1921?—Yes.

22191. How many of these occurred?—Twelve. Mr. Moriarty's case occurred earlier.

22192. Is that a complete list?—It is as many as I could get.

The CHAIRMAN.—That is 12 cases in 8 years.

22193. Mr. HARRISON.—When did Dr. Alexander come to your district?—In 1906.

22194. Some of these were in 1905?—Yes, Mr. Moriarty's. Dr. Alexander's first visit to me was in July, 1907. He was absent considerably before that. I don't know the exact date of his appointment.

The earliest dismissal he could bring about would be in 1903?—

22195. Mr. HENLY.—You can say earlier; he was seven years in the district?—Somewhere about that—I cannot tell the exact date.

22196. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, you want to state another case?—Yes, if you will allow me, I'll take the case of Mrs. Earl, of Carrigrohane National School, Arklow. Three teachers have been dismissed out of that parish—1911. First, I'll give the case in short. She was trained in Kildare Street, and classed as First of Second; she was dismissed by the Board on June 30, 1912, because of alleged inefficiency.

22197. The CHAIRMAN.—She was appointed to a principalship in Clonsilla, but action was refused by the Board?—Yes. She has sent in a long statement, and I will read part of it.—"I have appealed against the Board's decision to dismiss me, but got no redress. I have had varied experience of teaching, even in South Africa, where I went for the sake of my late husband's health. I always gave the manager full satisfaction, and managed to please the inspectors, until Mr. Dickie neglected or forgot to examine my school in 1908. I inadvertently mentioned the matter to Dr. Alexander. Mr. Dickie came to examine, and accused me of telling the Senate that he had not examined the school, and reduced the report to 'middling.' From that out, everything I did was displeasing to the inspectors, and in 1912 I was dismissed from this school.—(Signed), JANE EARL." Then there is a statement to the following effect, signed by the manager:—"I certify that Mrs. Earl is a lady of exceptionally good character and conduct. I appealed to the Board against her dismissal from my school, but without effect. Her dismissal was against my will and without my consent.—(Signed), FREDERICK W. COVENS. Dated 21st December, 1912." She taught in Kilmahony, and has a recommendation from the clergyman there. She has also an excellent recommendation from Ennisworthy, Co. Wicklow, and from the Rector of Carlow, and Dean of Leighlin, the Rev. John Finlay.

22198. The CHAIRMAN.—What were her merit marks for a series of years?—She came back from South Africa, and was appointed to Red Cross School, where she got "good" from Mr. Dickie in 1905. The next year she got "fair" in the same school, then she was transferred to Carrigrohane in 1907 and got "fair." In 1908 there was no examination; in 1909 she was reduced to "middling"; in 1910 Dr. Alexander gave her "middling"; in 1911 Mr. Dickie came, and then she was threatened, and the final examination for dismissal, and dismissal took place in 1912.

22199. She had three "middlings" in that case?—She got a school at Kilmahony, near Ennisworthy. She was appointed to it in the beginning of this year, and she sent in a salary claim, and the claim was refused. Here is the letter refusing her salary:—"Dublin, 26th April, 1913. Reverend Sir,—I am directed by the Commissioners of National Education to inform you that the appointment of Mrs. Jane Earl as principal teacher of the above-named school

4th September, 1913.]

Mr. CAR MacSWINEY examined.

[Continued.]

cannot be sanctioned. By order of the Board, dated the 26th April, 1913, salary was withdrawn from Mrs. Earl, as principal teacher of Carrycote National School, Co. Wicklow, from the 1st July, 1912, and she was declared ineligible for further recognition as a principal teacher of any National school after that date, in view of the very inefficient manner in which she performed her duties." The manager of the school, who is a Protestant, had another letter, dated May 26th, 1913, as follows:—"Reverend Sir,—Dr. Starke asks me to say in reply to your letter regarding the recognition of Mrs. Jane Earl as principal teacher of Kilmansheen National School, that the Board ordered some time ago that salary should be withdrawn from this teacher as Principal of Carrycote National School, Co. Wicklow, and that she could not be recognised again as principal teacher of a National school. In view of this order, it is not within Dr. Starke's discretion to sanction her recognition as principal of your school; he regrets that he is not prepared to move the Board to alter their order as to this matter." That was the state of affairs in May, but for some reason or another, the Board has since sanctioned her appointment, because the inspector reported in this way—

22180. You have that letter of the Board sanctioning her appointment?—No, except in her own statement.

22181. It is a pity we have not that statement?—You remember that the Board refused, and Dr. Starke refused to bring the case before the Board, yet on July 2nd, Mrs. Earl writes to say she has been recognised.

22182. What was the interval between the refusal and the recognition by the Board?—The last refusal was on May 9th, and I got her letter on the 2nd July.

22183. The CHAIRMAN.—It would not be quite two months. Have you any other statement to make on that case?—I have a written statement from herself, and I have the report on the school. I have the report on the occasion of her dismissal from Carrycote.

22184. I think we ought to have that statement read?—The General Report of the 26th June, 1913, again showed the school to be 'middling,' and in summing up the week the inspector wrote, 'Some of the pupils read well, and fair work has been done in needlework, but proficiency in arithmetic, geography, and grammar are most unsatisfactory, and the tone is inefficient and dull.' The Senior Inspector was now instructed to hold a formal inspection of the school, and in the month of December, 1913, the teacher was warned of his visit, and informed that unless the inspector was able to report a marked change for the better in the manner in which she performed her duties, the Commissioners would have to consider the question of withdrawing salary from her. The Senior Inspector visited the school on the 20th December, 1913, and his report contains the following statement:—

22185. Mr. HARRISON.—Is this the full report?—Yes, this is what she got from the Board, showing why she should be dismissed:—"The school is conducted in a feeble, unskilful and unsystematic manner; the children attending it receive no education worthy of the name; no attempt is made to train them or to arouse and develop their thinking powers. The instruction given is of the most mechanical kind. The teacher makes no preparation for her work, and hence she has no clear aim. I asked her for written evidence of preparation for the reading lessons, but she had none. I selected two words in the reading lesson for seniors, and asked her how she would explain them to the pupils, but she was unable to deal with them; it turned out indeed that she had no clear idea of the meaning of one of them (namely, 'engrossed') herself. The reading lesson given to the juniors exemplified every possible fault. There was really no teaching; the teacher did nothing but examine the pupils; the children mumbled through the lesson in an indistinct monotonous tone, and Mrs. Earl did nothing to improve them. No new words were written on the blackboard, and there was absolutely no model reading by the teacher. An occasional correction of a mispronunciation was all the

guidance given. When confronted with an easy arithmetical question, expressed in problem form, the seniors were utterly helpless. Oral answering is almost always a mere riddle. No training is given in speaking. The lengthened warning this teacher has received has not stimulated her in the least degree to increased exertion." She was dismissed on that date on inspection, but there is no evidence that there was an examination.

22186. Mr. HARRISON.—There was an examination in reading?—He listened to them reading.

22187. May it not be inferred that there was a test in arithmetic?—There was only one.

The CHAIRMAN.—I inferred he was listening to the teacher?

Mr. HARRISON.—Not in arithmetic.

22188. The CHAIRMAN.—But in reading?—He listened to the children.

22189. She was giving the lesson?—Yes, Inspector, "the reading lesson given exemplified almost every possible fault."

22190. Mr. HARRISON.—What about arithmetic?—He says, "When confronted with an easy arithmetical question, expressed in problem form, the seniors are utterly helpless."

22191. There was some test then?—There was one in arithmetic.

22192. Does he say anything about any other subject—about singing, or drawing, or geography?—Not a word.

22193. Or composition or dictation?—No. The teacher herself stated to him that she had prepared parties for the Earl of Wicklow, and got great praise for children's recitation, and that when the children read well, 'one of the inspectors said, "Protestant children all learn reading at home."'

22194. Sir HYAM WILKINSON.—He said Protestant children all learn reading at home?—The teacher herself makes that statement; she says, "As teacher of the above-named school I have suffered great hardship through the intolerance of inspectors. My reports have been lowered to 'middling,' and the salary withdrawn from June 30, 1911. The junior inspector, Mr. Dicks, forgot to examine the school in 1908. I inadvertently mentioned the fact to the Senior Inspector. After school had been closed for six weeks, Mr. Dicks came to examine on February 26th, 1909. He examined the reading and arithmetic, and told me the reading was good, but said that was a thing Protestant children learned at home. He said the recitation was splendid. Neither of these remarks appeared on the report. On the previous report, reading, grammar and geography were stated to need much working up, and arithmetic was very unsound. He made a number of remarks about not reminding him that the school was not examined, although I had done so. He asked me was I ever in charge of a school before, and said I was doing nothing here. Finally he said he was surprised that I was so cheerful, and asked did I not know what he could do. He succeeded in carrying out his threat by alleging inefficiency. Both he and the Senior Inspector annoyed me from that date."

22195. The CHAIRMAN.—Is that Mr. Dicks?—Yes. I might add here, she was appointed to a school in Carlow and in Cork and gave much satisfaction; then she married, and her husband became delicate, and she took him out to South Africa, where she got a school and was highly recommended. Her husband died, and she came to Red Cross, and got transferred to a smaller endowed school. She was then dismissed, but got transferred to the Co. Clare, and is giving satisfaction there. She is a young woman, full of vigour, and I cannot imagine her to be inefficient in any way. In the parish in which I live there is another school—

22196. Mr. HARRISON.—How many schools are there in the parish?—Seven. In Aughrim there are two Protestant and five Catholic schools. It is not a large parish, but it is mountainous, and these teachers are buried away into little valleys. One of these teachers, Mrs. Whalen, was forced out on £5 a year pension. Miss Meagher was forced out on, I think, £50 a year. Mrs. O'Neill, dismissed in 1903. There was Mr. Christie Byrne, who succeeded a lady

teacher, he was sent out because he was a man, and that the school was too small; the manager contested the case until he got another school, and he is doing well now. These four were in my parish.

22197. The CHAIRMAN.—These were dismissed in your parish?—No, four.

22198. Mr. HANNAH.—You cannot count the last man?—Here is what I have in my notes, "Ordered to leave; manager succeeded in keeping him on."

22199. He was ordered to leave, but not for any inefficiency?—No, not for inefficiency.

22200. Mr. HANNAH.—There is one peculiar case that you refer to in your notes—Ballaghkeane National School, Co. Wexford; teacher, Mr. McCormack?—Yes, I'll go through that. This was a young man who was studying for the Church but changed his mind, and is now teaching. Dr. Alexander made some entries in the observation book on his visit on December 16th, 1912. Mr. McCormack wrote to him relative to these observations, and knowing that his diploma and movement depended upon the Inspector, he pointed out their injustice, and Dr. Alexander, in an interview in the presence of the manager, intimated that his report on the school depended on the receipt or non-receipt of an apology. Mr. McCormack states that Dr. Alexander said on the 18th February that he had not yet sent in the report of the school, that it was to be "good," but that the teacher's letter had blown it all up. So Mr. McCormack had to make an apology. But I prefer not to go further into that case, because I believe he is to be examined as a witness.

22201. The CHAIRMAN.—What does this lead to?—It leads to this, that the report of Dr. Alexander to the Board depended not upon the work done in the school, but on whether Mr. McCormack would apologise for writing a certain letter.

22202. Mr. COFFEY.—Have you any documentary evidence of that from Dr. Alexander?—Mr. McCormack has the original document, I have only copies, but you have his name as a witness, if you wish to call him.

22203. The CHAIRMAN.—Are there any more cases of dismissals?—I have a list, but if you think you have enough of statements on dismissals, I'll be satisfied to leave it there, and I'll take some cases of dismissals on investigation by inspectors.

22204. Does that mean investigation by chief inspectors?—Yes, senior inspectors.

22205. We want to hear about that very much. We have not had a single case of that kind yet?—I have one case, and I wrote a report of it to the Irish School Weekly at the time. This unfortunately brings in the managers. It is a case which on appeal to His Eminence Cardinal Logue was settled very satisfactorily. The case in the Irish School Weekly is headed "Report of the Sub-Committee of the C.E.C. on the case of Mr. Thomas Finnan, late of Knockbridge National School." The paper in which this report appeared was the 4th March, 1911, and this Committee was appointed in October, 1910, and the report says:—

"Having fully investigated the case, they found that Mr. Finnan appeared for protection from his manager to the diocesan authorities as early as 1908. In that year Dean Byrne wrote to him:—'I see no source of redress except through an appeal to the Cardinal. I would therefore respectfully suggest that you would place your whole case before His Eminence.' Mr. Finnan acted on this advice. Subsequently his manager brought him before the petty sessions court on certain charges, which were unanimously dismissed by the five magistrates before whom the case was tried. The manager appealed to the Commissioner. A senior inspector was sent to investigate the case. Charges similar to those made before the magistrates were brought forward, not one of which was attested on oath. The Inspector transmitted to the Board a report of the proceedings largely from memory, since it does not appear that a shorthand note-taker was employed. The result was the dismissal of Mr. Finnan, and at a day's notice, as the order for the withdrawal of his salary did not reach him until

the day from which payment of that salary was to cease. Thus, at one stroke, he was deprived both of salary and of person rights, though he is classed First of First, has a First Grade Training Diploma, and never till then incurred official censure during the twenty-nine years he spent in the public service under the National Board, and all on evidence on which the most noted malefactor could be fined not one penny nor sentenced to a single hour's imprisonment. Acting on the advice of local teachers and with the authority of the C.E.C., the sub-committee sought an interview with the Cardinal, with a view to obtaining another school for Mr. Finnan. His Eminence replied as follows:—

"Ara Coib, Arinnagh,

"12th November, 1910.

"Dear Sir,—It would be only useless trouble and expense to send a deputation to me on behalf of Mr. Finnan. It would be only trying to force an open door. I sympathise with Mr. Finnan and am as anxious to get a school for him as your committee could be. I am not manager of any school, but I recommended his appointment to some managers when schools became vacant. I find they have no doubt as to his capabilities as a teacher, or to his general conduct; but, owing to indispositions he has given, they think he would be likely to give them trouble. There is one manager who is likely to have a school vacant, and to whom I spoke about Mr. Finnan. He seems inclined to give Mr. Finnan a trial if the school becomes vacant. That is the most I can do in the matter, as I cannot force managers to take teachers against their will; and it is the only answer I could give to a deputation. Of course you are aware that Mr. Finnan was dismissed from his school by the National Board without any reference to me. I was given no opportunity of interfering in the matter."

Again in answer to an enquiry, as to when a school might be vacant, His Eminence replied:—

"Dear Sir.—The vacancy to which I referred as likely to afford an opening to Mr. Finnan, depends on a vacancy which is likely to occur in June next."

"The C.E.C. considered these letters most satisfactory, but in view of the impending change in the pension rules, the sub-committee was directed to point out to the Cardinal the loss Mr. Finnan should sustain if he were not in the service at the time the new rules should be adopted, and to request His Eminence to provide him with a place if possible early in the new year. Some further correspondence passed, and the following letter was received on January 25th:—

"Ara Coib, Arinnagh,

"24th January, 1911.

"Dear Sir,—Mr. Finnan was appointed to a school before your letter of the 12th inst. reached me. Telling it for granted that the fact would become known to you, I thought a reply unnecessary. I am, dear Sir, yours faithfully,

"MICHAEL CARD. LOGUE.

"Mr. C. MacSwiney."

"Needless to say, the Cardinal's action has given the greatest satisfaction to the teachers, and will enhance the cordial relations which happily exist between them and the Catholic clerical managers. It is far otherwise with regard to the National Board. The teachers can have no sense of security while they know that, as in Mr. Finnan's case, neither high professional requirements nor long and satisfactory service can avail to save them from dismissal on unattested charges reported to the Board merely from memory. The following resolutions in reference to this case were adopted by the C.E.C. at the January meeting:—I. 'That in view of the recent dismissal of Mr. Finnan from Knockbridge Boys' National School on charges unattested

on oath, and hence on which the most noted malefactor could be fined but one penny nor sentenced to a single hour's imprisonment, we beg to point out to the Commissioners of National Education the fearful miscarriage of justice likely to occur when unsworn allegations, reported to the Board largely from memory, are accepted as evidence, as they have been in Mr. Finnan's case; and we therefore earnestly request the Commissioners to confine to the usage of all other branches of the public service in the three kingdoms when investigating charges against their officials involving grave consequences. 2. "We call upon the Commissioners of National Education to pay Mr. Finnan full salary for the time they have unjustly deprived him of same; and to compensate him as far as compensation is possible for the injury to his health caused by the year of mental agony through which he has passed." 3. "That we hereby respectfully beg to tender to His Eminence Cardinal Logue the expression of our most grateful thanks for his action in the Finnan case, and to assure him that in appealing to His Eminence we were confident his action would be of the considerate and fatherly character it has proved to be."

22206. Mr. HARRISON.—What was Mr. Finnan dismissed for?—Disagreement between himself and his manager.

22207. That is the Board did not dismiss him, but allowed the manager to do so?—No, they sent down a senior inspector to investigate the difference between himself and the manager.

22208. The manager dismissed him previously?—No, he could not do that without the consent of the Bishop.

22209. The Bishop or Boss.—You recommended him to appeal to the Cardinal?—Dean Byrne did, and he appealed to the Cardinal in 1908. In that year Dean Byrne wrote—

Mr. HARRISON.—I don't see where the Board came in.

Mr. HENRY.—They ordered an investigation, and he was dismissed.

22210. Mr. HARRISON.—Who conducted it?—Mr. Hogan, the senior inspector.

22211. The Bishop or Boss.—Was the Board aware he had appealed to the Cardinal?—I could not tell.

22212. Because it would be curious if they interfered until they knew that the Cardinal had dealt with the case, did he really appeal to the Cardinal?—Yes. As early as 1908. Dean Byrne wrote to him.

22213. He is Dean of the Arch Diocese, and he was also Chairman of the Clerical Catholic Managers' Association?—Yes, and he wrote to him, saying, "I see no source of redress, except an appeal to the Cardinal. I would, therefore, respectfully suggest that you should place your whole case before His Eminence." Mr. Finnan acted upon that advice.

22214. The CHAIRMAN.—Did he say what the decision of the Cardinal was?—Yes, the decision of the Cardinal was that he would not consent to the manager dismissing him.

Mr. COOPER.—Then the manager reported him to the Board, and the Board, on the complaint made at the investigation, decided to remove him—

22215. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—One thing occurs to me that might have brought the matter to the notice of the Board, without the intervention of the manager, and that is the fact that there were some proceedings before the Courts. Were these proceedings against him taken by the manager?—Yes.

22216. The dispute was evidently made public in that way?—Yes.

22217. Mr. HARRISON.—In cases of that sort, is any report of the investigation issued to the people concerned?—Not that I ever heard of.

22218. Can you speak definitely of that?—I got no report in my case, except the decision.

22219. But your case was rather different, as I understand it. Here was a case involving dismissal from the school?—Yes.

22220. His case was a case of investigation of an officer appointed by the Board, and I want to know were the grounds of the decision ever issued to the

people concerned?—That I cannot tell you. I never heard they were. I know that in another case, their decision was merely given.

Their decision, but not the grounds for their decision?—

22221. The CHAIRMAN.—You mention another case of investigation?—Yes, I'll give the facts of that case; it was the case of a teacher named Mr.—

Co. Meach. The investigation

was held on the 1st April, 1913. Mr.—

punished a boy for insolent assault going home from school, the mother, Mrs.—, complained to the office, and Mr. Rogers held an investigation on June 13, 1913. He told the teacher to give in a written statement of his case, and gave him five minutes to prepare it. Mrs.— had a full statement prepared, showing that she had got ample notice. That was on June 13th, and on July 13th, the inspector wrote to Mrs.—, suggesting that she should get another statement from another woman to support the evidence against the teacher. I have the letter. The Board decided that Mr.— should have informed the manager, before punishing Mrs.—

boy. Their own rule says that the manager is to be shown the entry in the corporal punishment book on his first visit after such punishment. There does not seem to have been any other penalty inflicted on Mr.—.

22222. I think we may pass that by, and take another more fruitful case?—The only point is that fact that after the investigation was over, the inspector wrote for further evidence, and that that letter was written to Mrs.— on the 13th July, 1913, while the investigation took place in June. That letter asked her to get a statement from the parents of —, to the effect that he was injured on an occasion when he was punished by the Principal of the school, that is the point I want to mention.

22223. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Asking for evidence of another assault?—Yes. There is just one other case of investigation—I don't know whether the teacher was right or wrong—but I have the opinion of a solicitor who was present.

22224. The CHAIRMAN.—First give us the facts of the case?—This is a case of the Court National School, County Wicklow. The teacher has a son, a young fellow of 19 or 20 years of age, who has endeared himself to the children. This young fellow came to the school at a quarter past nine in the morning. There were two or three boys in the school, and he said to them, "Come and do something on the farm or about the farm." Two or three of the boys went; he kept them for that week, and paid them. Their mothers were content, but the manager reported the matter to the Board, and an investigation was held, and the teacher was reprimanded and was fined £5. As to the merits or demerits of the case, I don't know anything, but I want you to hear a solicitor's opinion as to the mode of conducting the investigation. Mr. T. B. Moffat, B.A., solicitor, Kinsmore and Dublin, writes as follows:—"Dear Sir,—I send you herewith copy of the charges made by Father Kane, also the notes taken by me at the inquiry of the evidence. You will note that the charge made by Father Kane is quite inconsistent with the statements. The charge itself shows animus on the part of Father Kane, as it consists of a charge against you of having too much land on hand, whilst the real charge is contained in the statements dealing merely with the luring of the children who ought to be in school. From a solicitor's standpoint you may inform those who take an interest in your case on behalf of the National school teachers, that in my opinion, as a result of attending inquiries of this sort, school teachers are placed at a very serious disadvantage at these inquiries, as they are not allowed to examine or cross-examine witnesses, and in your case the whole of the charges could on cross-examination have been shown to have been based on private prejudice, to use a very mild word. The rulings of Dr. Alexander that he would decline to allow questions dealing with any matter but the attendance of the children at school and at your farm shows that as representing the Commissioners of Education he

would decline to take evidence showing that the charges were brought merely out of pure malice. That being so, a salubrious act such as inquiry is practically of no use. The position of school teachers is rendered almost impossible. They are underpaid, and when subjected to charges such as your case, have really no opportunity of defending themselves. In almost every instance persons against whom charges are brought should have an opportunity of being properly defended. Were the compulsory clauses of the Education Act of 1893 in force they could be enforced, and against anyone engaging a child the penalty would be £3. The compulsory clauses in your case are not in force, and the result may be that you will be subjected to a penalty of loss of service, losing your salary for life. The difference is, therefore, grotesque, as a gross hardship, in my opinion, inflicted on teachers in your position." I have a salubrious opinion upon another case.

Mr. CORRY.—Don't rub it, it will do no good.

22223. The CHAIRMAN.—I was hoping you had some case of an appeal about inefficiency, where an investigation by a chief inspector was ordered, so that we would know the whole procedure the Board adopted?—In my experience of dismissals for inefficiency, no appeals are granted.

22224. For inefficiency, or any offences that lead to dismissal?—You have the case of the dismissal of Mr. Finn, and my own case might have led to dismissal.

22225. Mr. HANNAH.—Am I right in saying that in cases of investigations no report is sent down by the investigating officer?—No report is sent to the teacher. I have never heard of one, there was no report in my own case. I didn't hear of one in Mr. — case or in Mr. Finn's case.

22226. Is there anything in your notes that you would wish to amplify?—I would like to say something about cases of appeals refused. There is a case of Kilmoyl National school, teacher Michael Doyle.

22227. Mr. KAVANAGH.—We had this case before. One of the inspectors told us about the case?—The teacher is a fine young fellow, devoted to his business.

22228. Mr. HANLY.—That is a case about the examinations being held upon an unsuitable day and without notice?—There are two of those cases where teachers allege that inspectors have been incontinent and where the inspectors have been reported to the Board.

22229. To whom did they allege that?—To the manager, and he reported it to the Board.

22230. The teacher went to his manager, and he reported the matter?—Yes, and it practically amounted to this. The inspector had been rude to the teacher before the children. The teacher felt very humiliated, and reported the matter to the manager, and the manager reported it to the Board; the Board wrote back and said we have referred the matter to the inspector, and he denies there is any foundation for the charge. The other case happened in the parish to which I belong last October.

22231. What is the name of the teacher?—Miss Connack.—She has a little school in Angharavagh, near where Mr. Richmond lives.

22232. Tell us about that case?—The school is Mucklagh, Co. Wicklow, and the teacher Miss Catherine Connack, she had taken some degree in sanitary science; she was trained in St. Mary's, Belfast, 1904-06; served as assistant in Rossmore National School, Bray, from 1906 to 1909; assistant in Warrenstown National School from February to July, 1909; principal teacher from 2nd July to the present time in Mucklagh National School. Her merit mark in 1910, Mr. Dickie, was "good"; in 1911, "good," Mr. Dickie. But she says, "in October, 1912, he reduced the merit mark to 'fair,' thereby depriving me of an increment. I have received only one increment dating from July, 1909, so that I would be entitled to a second increment in 1912 if merit mark was not altered. Mr. Dickie reduced the merit mark without sufficient cause, as he admitted in a conversation before he left the school that he thought he could give me 'good.' The rev. manager requested a re-examination of the school, but it was not granted nor has the increment been paid, though the senior inspector in March, 1918, informed

the manager that he found the school very much improved. The senior inspector had not been there for three years before, yet he found the school very much improved. The manner of the inspector was such that he was guilty of rudeness in asking needlessly insulting questions, such as 'did you steal your Irish certificate?' He asked some of the children, 'have you seen this needlework before?' He reproved me because he felt odd and became his coat full of a nail on which it hung. He contradicted the children in a very disagreeable manner, even when they are right in some cases. He contradicted the children in a very disagreeable manner, even when they are right in some cases. The manager complained of his manner, but he stated that he had said nothing that could insult the teacher. In a previous year the inspector, Mr. Dickie, reported to the Board that I had obtained Capitulation Grant for one more than I was entitled to, and he was afterwards very displeased with me because I wrote to the Board when sending the order as requested that my averages were right, as he found them to be on a subsequent visit. He then told me I should not have written to the Board." The manager appealed against the lowering of the teacher's report and depriving her of her increment. He also complained about the results of the inspector. The Board wrote back and said perhaps we will give increment next year. I have all the correspondence.

22233. The CHAIRMAN.—Will you read the letter of the Board in reply to the manager?—Yes, I have that letter. "Office of National Education, Dublin, 2nd April, 1918. Reverend Sir,—Referring to your letter of the 27th January and 14th ultimo, regarding the general inspection of this school held last October, in which you take exception to the lowering of the merit mark from 'good' to 'fair,' and request further particulars on the point, I am directed to inform you that the approved official course was taken in this case, and the senior inspector was consulted and concurred in the lowering of the mark. I am to quote for your information extracts from reports which have been received from him in reference to his concurrence in the action taken by the district inspector:—'I beg to state that I visited this school three times since the appointment of Miss Connack. On each occasion I noticed that she was wanting in energy, and did not, herself, speak distinctly or train the pupils to do so. The children were slow and heavy in manner, and showed little brightness or intelligence. When Mr. Dickie inspected the school in October last, he found that while proficiency was in some respects good, other subjects were taught with only mediocre success, and that the pupils showed a want of earliness and grip, and were extremely slow in speech. Such a school could not be classed as 'good.' Reading is distinct and, on the whole, expressive, and the written work is of very fair quality. Arithmetic is taught with a good deal of intelligence. On the other hand, no proper foundation is laid in geography; the pupils need more guidance in sewing; at object lessons, answers are taken in chorus, and are not always expressed in complete sentences, the pupils are somewhat awkward at kindergarten exercises, and a higher standard of merit in drawing is desirable. Attention has been called to these defects by oral and written observations.'"

22234. The CHAIRMAN.—What was the merit mark she obtained?—"Fair," otherwise that year she would get her increment. The letter continues—"With reference to your complaint, that at the inspection of October last the inspector made insulting remarks to the teacher, in the presence of the pupils, which would be likely to destroy her influence on them." I am to inform you that Mr. Dickie, the inspector in question, states that there is no foundation for this charge. I am to point out for your information that it is the practice to refer, in the minute sent home this office, and taken from the inspector's general report, only in brief form to any defects in the teacher's methods, or other matters affecting the general proficiency, that may be observed at the inspection. These points are dealt with in greater detail in the observation book which is kept in the school for the purpose; in the present case particulars of any defects, etc., were duly noted in the book and are available. It is further to be observed that, as there was no officially recognised

4th September, 1933.]

Mr. Con MacSWANEY examined.

[Continued.]

acting manager during the interval that elapsed between the demise of the Reverend J. Coffey, P.P., and your appointment as his successor, Mr. Dickie was not in a position to give any notification of his intention to visit and inspect the school. The intimation of your appointment as Parish Priest of this district, and of your desire to be recognised as manager of the schools in the parish, was only received in this office on 26th November last. In the circumstances it would have been irregular for Mr. Dickie to have taken a different course of action to that followed by him. In regard to Dr. Alexander's omission to send you notification of his visit to this school on the 10th ultimo, which you consider should have been done, in view of the terms of Rule 68, I beg to furnish you with the following observations on the point submitted by Dr. Alexander. "I might say that Dr. Alexander came to visit the school, but did not notify the manager. The manager objected, and said he should have been notified, and this is Dr. Alexander's explanation. I will give the manager's answer in a moment. "I proposed to visit three schools at least in the ordinary incidental way on 10th March, 1934—Mucklagh, Shenna, and Ballycraun. The duration of my stay in each was entirely dependent on circumstances. I had no previously formed intention on the point. After spending some time in Mucklagh National School I noticed signs of improvement. As it was likely that the question of raising the merit mark of the school would be considered in the coming year, I thought it well to avail myself of the opportunity of making fuller notes than I at first contemplated, and of testing progress of subjects not taught while I was present. I reported the result to the manager—that is, that I found the school business proceeding regularly—and the same week had a (lengthened interview with him" (only on question of new building). It will be seen that in the first instance Dr. Alexander did not intend to spend a considerable time in the school, and accordingly the circumstances in which you were not made aware of his presence was purely accidental. As the senior inspector decided to peckish his inspection, it would have been desirable for him to have the advantage of your presence, having regard to the important points at issue; but owing to the distance of the school from your residence this was not practicable. Dr. Alexander desires that your attention be drawn to the fact that he was not accompanied by any officer of the Board at this visit, and that he has no knowledge of the other inspector to whom you refer in your letter of the 18th ultimo. With regard to the award of an increment of continued good service salary, I am to point out that, in view of the terms of the general report, dated 21st October, 1932, which had reference to the period of service of the teacher since the preceding general report in August, 1931, the Commissioners are unable to make the award of increment at present, but the claim will be again considered in connection with the next general report of the school." The manager complained he was not acquainted with the fact that the inspector was to examine at length. The inspector said he only intended to stay a short time. "You cannot prove it," said the inspector. "Well, the car-driver was sent away at 10 a.m. and told to come back at one o'clock; but we are only pointing to the fact that the report was lowered in the increment year. The other point is that the manager appealed against redness on the part of the inspector. The Board referred the matter to the inspector, and he decided there was any foundation for the charge. The very same occurred in the case of Michael Doyle. The matter was referred to the inspector. He denied it. Both inspectors found fault with the needlework in this school. There was recently a county agricultural show, and there were nine competitions in needlework. The pupils of this teacher, whose work was not good enough in the eyes of the inspectors, won six of these prizes.

22297. Mr. HEWITT.—Do you mean you prize in different classes?—No, working different articles.

22298. The CHAIRMAN.—Are there any other cases?—I have several cases which I could go into, but probably what I want now is cases of reports lowered in the increment year. If you care to hear them I have a few.

22299. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—Will you be able to give us any idea of the proportion?—I'll give you all I can.

22300. Cases where individual schools were lowered won't bring us to anything unless you have some statistics?—I cannot make comparisons. All the teachers did not send in their cases, they are rather afraid, but I'll give you what I have.

22301. The CHAIRMAN.—Without statistics, as I understand his lordship, single cases will not prove a general result. You want to bring out that there was a general lowering of marks in the increment year. Have you statistics that will prove that?—I have five or six cases.

The BISHOP OF ROSS.—They will prove nothing. The inference will be, here as Mr. MacSwaney and he can only produce five or six out of hundreds of teachers.

The CHAIRMAN.—And a man on the opposite side might find five or six cases where the mark was raised in the increment year.

The BISHOP OF ROSS.—It will be said that you were only able to find five or six cases out of so many. Remember it is for you to judge the value of this evidence.

22302. Mr. HARRISON.—It would be that so many cases occurred within a certain area and within a certain time.—Mr. MacNeill says that in the third year's report the inspector's showed leniency?—And Mr. Dilworth makes the same statement. I have quoted one case, and the next case is important, I think, also.

22303. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—He says I am a leniency to leniency in the third year, but that does not mean in every case. Leniency is consistent with reducing a report in individual cases?—I have no statistics that give comparisons, but here is a typical case.

22304. How can you say it is a typical case if you have no statistics?—It is an individual case, but you cannot call it a typical case?—Well, you see there are five or six cases from one district.

That is something.

22305. Mr. HARRISON.—Within what period of time? How many years?—Within three years.

22306. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—That is two cases each year on the average?—That is cases that have come to my knowledge.

22307. Out of how many schools?—Possibly 60, but there are under the same inspectors.

22308. Mr. HARRISON.—There would be a large number in which no increase was due?—I have rather a peculiar case here of lowering of report and loss of increment. The school is the Chapeland Girls' School, and the teacher Mrs. Sarah J. Donovan. The inspector, Mr. Murphy, examined on a very cold day. The teacher appealed, and so did the teacher of the boys' school. The appeal was granted, and the same inspector came and examined again.

22309. The CHAIRMAN.—The same man who had made the previous report?—Yes, he examined again.

22310. What was the result?—He confirmed his own report. Perhaps, I might read this statement from the teacher.

If you think it will throw light upon your evidence well and good, but it is your responsibility.

22311. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—Do you think it will strengthen your evidence?—I think so.

Mr. HEWITT.—You want to give a case where the teacher has appealed, and where the appeal has been referred for decision to the very person whose decision was appealed against.

22312. Mr. HARRISON.—Have you any other cases of that kind, for it occurs to me that if you have one case where the allegation is that it was a very cold day, the inspector might say, "Very well, I shall be very glad to see if as normal circumstances I hold the same view?"—I should like to give the teacher's own statement:—"Chapelard Girls' School—Staff, principal and two assistants. Average attendance, 1910, 1911, 1912, 90.9; 1913, 95.3. Salary of principal teacher, £51, plus Capitation Grant and Birmil Grant. I was trained in Mary Immaculate Training College Mount Prospect, Invercick, during the Session 1903-4, having first spent five years as mistress. At the termination

of my College course I was appointed principal of a small school—Carnalech, Co. Sligo. On January 1st, 1905, I was appointed principal of Chapelizod Girls' N.S. This school was in a very low condition when I took charge, as it suffered considerably from changes of teachers during the previous year. Mr. Tibbs (now senior inspector), whom I always found courteous, sympathetic and helpful, gave me valuable assistance in my uphill work. He made an inspection in the following April, awarding the mark 'fair' with the following comment:—"This school has suffered considerably from changes of teachers. The present principal has done very good work since she has taken charge." Mr. Tibbs has changed within the year, and Dr. Bateman succeeded him. The latter gentleman had not seen the condition of the school at my appointment, and was not, therefore, competent to judge the work I had done. Some of the neighbouring and city schools were closed owing to the inclemency of the weather. The attendance was very low, the better class children remaining away, the poorer only being present, a good fire evidently attracting them. Our petrol room is 41 ft. by 21 ft., and one fire placed near the top could not raise the temperature much beyond the freezing point. The thermometer in the boys' school on three days registered 2 below zero. Mr. Murphy, well protected against the bitterness of the weather, without abating himself of merriment or over-eat, and Miss Pye, arrayed in full winter outdoor apparel, with face on and hands in mitt, without even removing the veil from her face, examined and inspected these poor shivering, half-frozen, and badly clad children. Such were the unfavourable conditions under which a school was examined for the instruments of its teachers. After a couple of hours' inspection on this and succeeding day, and inspecting boys' school on same days, he awarded the mark 'fair,' and so stopped all instruments. The principal of the boys' school and myself made a strong appeal to Dr. Starke for a re-inspection, and on the 18th June following Mr. Murphy again arrived. The result was naturally a foregone conclusion, although I had worked with double energy expecting a second inspection. He did not re-inspect the boys' school. The following is a copy of his first inspection, also copy of his second one, which was not sent in the ordinary way as a report, but as a defence of his conduct. I am also pointing out inconsistencies and false statements in those. Shall I go on with these reports?

This is her statement that the same inspector examined.

22238. The CHAIRMAN.—I do not think you will gain anything by giving it?—The fact is, the school was re-inspected and awarded the same report?—Yes.

22239. That is the point you want to make?—Yes. There is another case, that of the Ballyreen National School; teacher, Mrs. Allen.

22240. We have heard this before of a teacher adopting one inspector's methods, and then finding that they were repudiated?—I had an informal conversation with this teacher, and found that she had trained and taught successfully in her district. Many of her pupils are in good positions in Dublin and elsewhere. Mr. MacGaffrey, the Inspector under the Board of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, was a pupil of hers. She got on well, even under the new system, until 1905, when inspectors began to give instructions in method, and Mr. Dickie reduced the report to "middling." In 1905 this inspector found arithmetic "good," and reading "well taught." He gave several suggestions as to method, and as a result, the next year, 1906, the school was marked "middling." This year also Mr. Dickie gave several orders as to method, and so next year again the school was, in his opinion, only "middling." In his incidental visits this year Mr. Dickie filled pages of the observation book with directions as to method, and Mrs. Allen still tried to follow them, abandoning methods that she had used with success for thirty years. In 1908 Dr. Alexander examined, and found that incompetence on the part of the teacher was the cause of the low state of the school. The Board then wrote to the manager, saying that the school would be examined in three months' time, to try if Mrs. Allen's services could be retained. The manager retailed on Dr. Alexander, stating that he had attended school consistently, and knew that good

work was being done, and also that he was present at the examination and heard the children answering, and knew that they answered well. Mrs. Allen was in a painful state of prostration, owing to the loss of losing her position, and was able to teach very little for the three months allowed her.

22241. The CHAIRMAN.—Didn't the Board state in recommending her they would send an inspector to examine the school after one year?—Yes.

22242. He examined in three months?—Yes.

22243. Was that examination at the Board's order?—I could not tell, but he examined in three months, and found great improvement. From this Mr. Allen was not interfered with. Mr. Dickie noted her report to "fair" next year, and he has ceased offering suggestions.

22244. What is the conclusion?—That the teacher has reverted to her old methods with success.

22245. That is not the conclusion, that is one of the facts?—The conclusion, therefore, is, that the teacher having worked on certain lines for thirty years, had done well during all those years, but that under the new methods she had done badly, but when allowed to go back to those employed long before Mr. Dickie's time she seems to have done well again. Before Mr. Dickie began showing Mrs. Allen how to teach, Mr. Kyle found the school "good." He said in 1904—"The teacher conducts her school carefully, and intelligently. The pupils perform calculations mentally and otherwise with quickness and accuracy, and show unusual facilities in dealing with concrete problems." In 1905 Dr. Bateman found effective instruction had been given. In 1906 Mr. Dickie came and found good work was being done. He gave suggestions and directions, with the results shown. In 1907 the school got "fair" from Mr. Connolly, with the observation, "arithmetic very good." In 1908 it got "fair" from Mr. Strong. In 1904 "good" from Mr. Kyle. In 1905 "fair" from Dr. Bateman. In 1906 "fair" from Mr. Dickie, with pages of suggestions. He gave "middling" in 1907, and in 1908 he marked the school "inefficient." On the complaint of the manager of the school was again rated to "fair," and has continued so since.

22246. Mr. CONWAY.—What was the last report?—The last report was in 1902, when Mr. Lyman gave the mark "fair," and he added this note:—"The children are bright, cheerful, and anxious to learn. The school-room is well kept." In 1903 Dr. Alexander declared the teacher to be inefficient. All this can be seen in the inspectors' reports. Mr. Dickie, when he came, filled pages of the observation book with directions how to do this and that. Then Mr. Strong came; he was always reasonable, but he was in bad health at the time; then we have Mr. Dickie again, with directions as to how things are to be done. There are pages upon pages filled with his suggestions. Dr. Alexander wrote—"Verbs, nouns and adjectives in sentences must be emphasized."

22247. Mr. CONWAY.—One would imagine there can be very little else in sentences except nouns, verbs, and adjectives?—And he goes on to explain verbs and adverbs are to be pronounced clearly. I do not want to make any personal attack on the inspectors. I believe Mr. Dickie and Dr. Alexander are very honest and earnest men, but I am quite certain they are mistaken in switching old teachers off old and tried plans into new grooves and new methods.

22248. Mr. CONWAY.—These different suggestions and different views on the part of inspectors make the whole thing chaotic?—That is the worst of it.

22249. The CHAIRMAN.—Are you going to illustrate this difference of method by inspectors, or have we enough of it. If you have any fresh points now you might give them, or, perhaps, you would prefer to give your general view?—As a matter of fact, what I intended to do was to lay these points before you. Then I wanted to deal with Rule 94.

22250. We have had plenty of evidence upon that. You have a point in your notes about investigations and the evidence received at them?—Yes. Any kind of evidence is taken against a teacher; any person can allege anything he likes against him.

22290. Your point is that the investigating officer does not pay sufficient respect to the rules of evidence, and does not adopt a proper judicial mode of procedure?—I believe the inspector acts as directed by the Board.

22291. You believe that, but that is not evidence. We cannot accept your belief as evidence. If you could bring proof it would be a serious thing. I tell you plainly, I think it is not serving the teachers' case to offer to us as evidence what would not be accepted in any Court of Law?—I don't want to take it further.

22292. You suggest a suspicion?—What I want to say is that the inspectors probably act in accordance with the rules of the Board.

22293. According to what rules of the Board?—I don't know what rules.

22294. Remember the words you used were "direction of the Board"?—I meant the rules of the Board.

22295. Will you show us the rules of the Board which lead to this kind of investigation?—There are no rules I know of.

22296. What does it all mean, then?—The inspectors conducting these investigations act honestly in accordance with whatever rules there are.

22297. Mr. COFFEY.—Or practice?—Yes, practice or rules.

22298. The CHAIRMAN.—They are following recognised practice?—I expect so.

22299. Mr. HARRISON.—Is there any evidence that there is such a recognised practice?—That is the point I want to make.

22300. The CHAIRMAN.—The impression, to my mind, is that you intend to show considerable variety in the procedure?—I don't come here to say this thing is wrong. I come to point a moral.

22301. I wish you would?—I have put a number of investigations before you, and I don't say one thing or the other, but I leave it to yourselves to draw conclusions.

22302. I am doing this in your own interest, and trying to get something that would be real evidence, and would help us to frame a conclusion?—The point seems to me this: The inspector comes to hold an investigation, evidence is brought forward, and he listens to all this, and anybody can make any allegations he likes.

22303. Mr. HENLY.—Are you allowed to cross-examine?—You are not allowed to cross-examine, so the solicitor says in that statement I read to you.

22304. The CHAIRMAN.—You put it in this way: Investigative, as far as you can see, are conducted in such a way as to give no confidence in the results, and that that is done under the direction of the Board? When I said the directions of the Board, I meant the rules of the Board, if there are any. I should be glad, with regard to these investigations, if there was any chance of suggesting some improvement.

22305. Mr. COFFEY.—Do you think it desirable that the teacher should be represented by a solicitor, who would have the right to cross-examine?—Certainly.

22306. The BISHOP OF ROSA.—Are you aware of any rule, guiding the investigation of the actual cases that come up here?—No.

22307. Mr. HENLY.—Under the London County Council, if a charge is made against a teacher, the rule is this: It is heard by a sub-committee; it takes place at fixed hour; the charge and the teacher's reply are first read out. The Chairman then examines any witnesses who appear in support of the charge, and the teacher is entitled to cross-examine them. The teacher may then call any witnesses whose names he has sent in prior to the hearing, and may other witnesses with the consent of the Chairman. The Chairman and any member of the Sub-Committee, with the consent of the manager, may ask questions of the witnesses. The teacher may then address the Sub-Committee, and after that the Sub-Committee deliberates in private. Would an arrangement such as that satisfy your Organisation?—There is no statement on oath there. Would hearsay evidence be accepted according to that?

The Bishop of ROSA.—I think so; there is no oath there.

22308. Sir HUGH WILLIAMS.—There is a great dis-

inction between evidence on oath and hearsay. Hearsay is something you heard from somebody else. The admission of hearsay is quite a distinct thing from investigation on oath. I simply want to tell you that no inquiry on oath can be held unless under the sanction of an Act of Parliament. An Act of Parliament was passed many years ago to punish anybody who put any person on oath without the sanction of an Act of Parliament, so that when dealing with a matter of this sort you have got to infer that no inquiry on oath can be held, unless you obtain an Act of Parliament for that purpose?—I see. I don't think we could be satisfied with an investigation involving dismission, except carried on under legal conditions.

22309. The BISHOP OF ROSA.—Even for inefficiency in connection with the school?—Well, for inefficiency, I don't think we would want to hold an inquiry on oath.

22310. There are different inquiries. For instance, an inquiry as to inefficiency would be quite different from a charge of drunkenness, or stealing, or things like that?—It should be a sworn inquiry into charges of that kind, even if you required an Act of Parliament to do it.

22311. Of course, where the question was whether a teacher was answered properly or not, that would be administrative?—That would be professional. I don't think we would require it for that at all.

22312. Mr. HENLY.—You complain a good deal with regard to the interference of inspectors with the methods of the teacher?—I do.

22313. Are you aware of the instructions of the Board where they say at p. 145 of the evidence?—Inspectors and organisers should take care not to force upon the teachers any peculiar views of their own, and not to compel them to devote an undue amount of time and attention to some favourite subject?—I am aware of that.

22314. Did your Organisation make any effort by calling the attention of the Commissioners to the violation of that practice, or the alleged violation of it, by Dr. Alexander?—No. I did not bring that before them.

22315. There is another point; that the lowering of the mark of any school that has enjoyed a high standard for a considerable time should not be lightly determined, and such lowering should denote deterioration in the tone of the school, rather than an accidental or temporary decline in proficiency in any standard. In the case of the Chancery school there were three successive "goods," did the teacher, in making application, base her case upon that chance of the Tone Circular?—Very likely she did. I think I have her letter to Dr. Starkie upon that point. Here is her application for re-examination.

22316. Mr. COFFEY.—She had three successive "goods"?—Yes, three successive "goods," and then "fav."

22317. Who reduced the mark?—Mr. Murphy. I have complaints from several South Dublin teachers and from some North teachers.

22318. Mr. HENLY.—Mr. Murphy mentioned he gave 60 per cent. of "excellent" and "very good," although the "excellent" and "very good" for all Ireland were only about 25 per cent. Now, as representing the Central Committee, what is your view with regard to increments?—The thing has been in my mind for a long time, ever since the new system. A young man now is inclined to marry and to settle down. When I was appointed a teacher, it was possible for a man to start housekeeping before he was twenty-five; it was possible for him to keep a house and to marry, and I believe mostly all young people when they start out, if they are properly constituted, have that in their mind. It was possible, under the old system, before a man was thirty, to have £100 a year. Under the new system, you have to work until you are five or thirty before you have anything like £100 a year. Let me take a school at Little Bray. There was an average of 97 for the past year. The teacher is a very respectable man, he lives in Bray, his work is acknowledged to be good. The percentage of regularity is 97, the percentage all over Ireland is 60, and you could not possibly get that percentage of 97 in a school unless you conducted it very well. Little

4th September, 1915.]

Mr. Cos MacSwiney examined.

[Continued.]

Bray is a very poor place; he is there for ten years, and his increment is £7.

22295. The CHAIRMAN.—How long is he in the service?—He came in about 1880.

22296. What grade is he in now?—Third grade still, and he is a married man.

22297. The BRUNER or ROSS.—He ought to have more than that; he ought to have £84, at least!—He got one increment, and he began at £50.

22298. The Burrell Grant makes that £63 or £70. How did he only get one increment? The reports of the school must be bad?—They are "good" and "fair," and his work is praised all through.

22299. Your point is this, that the period of time before which the teacher can obtain what I may call a living wage is too long?—Yes. A person's increments go on increasing up to the very end, and I imagine the increments should be more rapid in the beginning, and may then slack off. A man should be able to get a living wage, and to start housekeeping before thirty-five or at most forty.

22300. You yourself were able to marry. You started well, you got a big school, and you say other young men were able to marry at twenty-five, but then a number of men, who had reached the age of thirty-five and even forty, never got a living wage!—I cannot say how that may be.

22301. Now, in the old times, a number of men started on big salaries. The total salaries were not as high as at present, and, therefore, if few men had big salaries, it must have meant that a considerable number of men of middle age and old men had small salaries!—That was the fault of the middle aged and old aged men.

22302. You mean then, of course, nobody should be allowed to marry or get on in the world except the few brilliant men?—Oh, no.

22303. Or people of average ability and average work ought never to have housekeeping wants at all? Oh, no. It would work out like this:—

I have before my mind this:—The total money given to the teachers for remuneration is something like half a million more than was given to the total number of teachers twenty years ago.

Mr. HENLY.—What about the increase in the number of teachers?

The BRUNER or ROSS.—£20,000 to junior assistants. Mr. HENLY.—But the increase in the number of teachers?—

22304. The BRUNER or ROSS.—Nobody will deny that the body of the teachers have more money now, and that men of thirty have a great deal more than they had thirty years ago!—I could not agree with that at all.

22305. Where does the money go?—It comes in at the top. Under the old system, when a person reached a certain point, he kept to that point and went along level.

22306. Your point is that there are too many men at the top, and too much given at the top?—I don't object to the top at all, or to what they get at the top, but I believe a man ought to reach a living wage sooner. Now a man may get an increment at sixty. I believe he should be able to reach a higher figure when young than he does to enable him to start housekeeping.

22307. The present top salary is £185, that is including the Burrell Grant. What top figure would you strike?—At what age?

22308. Well, take this man of sixty?—I am not concerned with him, I am concerned with the young men.

22309. What figure will you strike at the top, because if you want more money at the bottom you must cut it off at the top?—I want a living wage early in life, and for the top to be stationary.

22310. Are you prepared to take it off at the top?—I would rather not answer that. I am appealing for the people at the bottom. My idea might be crude, but I would make the system more uniform. At present you reach a certain level, then you go along with a very gradual rise for a long period, till you reach the top.

The CHAIRMAN.—I want to get an idea of the system before 1900. I wish to have a clear idea of

what a fair teacher with fair numbers might reach at thirty.

The BRUNER or ROSS.—About a couple of hundred. The CHAIRMAN.—Would he remain at that for the remainder of his life?

Mr. HENLY.—The best answer to that is this: The Commissioners sometimes go on the average salary, both antecedent to 1900 and since. The latest reports I have before 1900, giving the average salaries, is that of 1886. Now, the average salary for a third-class teacher—I am only taking the Parliamentary Grant—would be £72 or £73. A teacher leaving a training college would be in the second-class, and the average salary for a teacher of the second-class would be £90 to £4. Then they had credit for special distinction, that is answering with 65 per cent. all round, and they could work up into second division of first-class within two years.

The CHAIRMAN.—After leaving the training college?

Mr. HENLY.—Yes, in the early days of the training colleges, 1884-8-6, if a teacher in a school came up for one year's course of training, and a pupil teacher leaving the model school could get second class, and obtain a first class, on leaving the training college without ever having taught a school. The average salary for the Irish second division second class was £100 10s. 6d., and in three years more he could reach £138 8s. 6d. The average salary was at that point which Mr. MacSwiney has reached now. The teacher at thirty years of age, in the second class, would have an average salary of £90.

The BRUNER or ROSS.—Then to have a clear comparison, we should know the number of teachers in the first class and second class, and the enormous number that remained all through their lives at £72 a year, and never got beyond it.

Mr. HENLY.—That was their own fault.

The CHAIRMAN.—It may be the fault of their natural ability that never enabled them to get higher.

Mr. HENLY.—In the first division of first class, the number of teachers in 1889 was 853, including men and women.

The CHAIRMAN.—There are now 340 men.

Mr. HENLY.—In the second division of first class, there was 1,504, in the second class there was 4,960, and in the third or lowest class there was 6,435.

The CHAIRMAN.—Where can we get these statistics?

Mr. HENLY.—They are in the report for 1899. The average salaries were not given every year. You will get them in one year but not in another. Then came the increase in classification after the training colleges, and then we get the figures for 1900. I have given the numbers for 1890, and they would be considerably higher in 1900.

22311. (To Witnesses.)—I asked you a question which you did not answer. What was your view about increments? And you gave me instead a digression, as to whether the teachers were getting a living wage. The point is whether you would prefer to get an annual or a triennial increment?—Annual increment I say without hesitation.

22312. On what condition?—On condition of giving efficient service and freedom from official reproof.

22313. Now I will read for you, as I did yesterday for Mr. Mansfield, the conditions under which increments are granted in England:—"Annual increments of salary, according to scale, are allowed for each year's satisfactory service. The annual increment falls due on the first of the month following the anniversary of the teacher's entry into service. The phrase 'A year's satisfactory service' means a period of twelve months during which a teacher has not been guilty of any grave misconduct. Every year counts for an increase in salary up to the maximum, unless the Council decides otherwise." Would these conditions satisfy you?—Yes.

22314. Would they satisfy your Organisation?—I think so.

Mr. KAVANAGH.—Do you understand annual increment does not mean an increase of salary?—

22315. The BRUNER or ROSS.—Not beyond the present salaries?—I understand that.

22316. Mr. HENLY.—For instance, if it was possible to get three increments of three pounds instead of a triennial increment of £9, you would prefer an arrangement of that kind?—Decidedly.

22317. You come from a part of the country where attendance is at times irregular?—Yes.

22318. Do you think that the teachers should get notice of the holding of the inspection?—I think so.

22319. You think it would be desirable, in the interests of the teacher and the pupils?—I think so.

22320. Would you be in favour of each school having a school year, or of having a uniform school year?—That is a matter I have not looked into, but I think, with a sympathetic inspector, and a friendly Board, it would not matter what time the inspector came, provided you had your best pupils, and provided he only examined on the part of the year's programme that has passed. Many teachers are in favour of the uniform school year, but I think with proper administration, that would not be a difficulty.

22321. I have a case of a school in this city that was examined on the first of July, 1913, and the general report was awarded for the year ended the 31st of July, 1914. Do you think that was a satisfactory arrangement?—No, that is quite unusual.

22322. When do you think the general inspection should be held?—On which the report of the school depended?

22323. Yes; ought it to be near the end of the year?—As far as I can see, if you could depend on the inspector, and that the administration is right, I think it is quite equal what time the inspector comes, provided he examines on what I have said.

22324. You have experience of a uniform school year, for a considerable number of years? Has it worked out satisfactorily in your district?—Very satisfactorily.

22325. What is the cause of the lowering of reports and diplomas for inefficiency?—Generally unsympathetic administration, sort of touch with the teaching profession.

22326. Do you think examination at unsuitable times has anything to do with it?—I think so at present.

22327. Have you not made complaint that in one district there was an examination of the school when there was a fair in the neighbouring town?—Yes.

22328. Does not that arise under your present system?—Yes.

22329. Yet you think the system is working satisfactorily?—I don't say that, but I say that if we had a different system of administration and inspection, such as before 1909, it would be satisfactory.

22330. If you have sufficient faith that owing to our inquiry you will have all these things put right, I think I will not ask you any more?—I think something good will come out of this inquiry.

22331. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Would you rather go back to the results' system?—No.

22332. I thought you said to Mr. HENLY that you would?—I don't think he meant the results' system. He meant the examination of each school in its own school year.

22333. You spoke about the alarming increase in dismissals. Was that in the County of Wicklow, or in the whole of Ireland?—I was only talking Dr. Alexander's districts, and they embrace part of Westford and part of Dublin, as well as Wicklow.

22334. If a principal is dismissed for inefficiency, could he obtain employment under the Board as an Assistant?—Sometimes.

22335. Have any of those you mentioned got employment elsewhere?—No, not one, except in the case of Mrs. EARL, and you must remember, it is not easy to get an assistantship in a Protestant school, because few Protestant schools have assistantships.

Mr. HARRISON.—Does it not depend upon the wording of the dismissal in each case?—

22336. Mr. HENRY.—Could you show us the letters withdrawing salaries. In the case of Miss Connolly there were two letters saying salary would be withdrawn. Were they all in the same terms?—I have

not got those letters, and never had—I should like to say a word about the junior assistant mistresses. I have a junior assistant mistress; she was appointed amongst the very first, and I find that she does very useful work. I devoted a good deal of attention to her training and now she is quite useful. In the neighbouring school a junior was appointed and did good work, but the average of the school went up and she was superseded by a fully qualified assistant. This junior assistant mistress is thoroughly qualified and well able to teach, but she cannot get a place anywhere else, because if it happens that a junior assistant mistress resigns or is to be appointed, the selection is confined practically to the neighbourhood as a junior assistant mistress only gets £24. If paid something like a living wage the junior assistant would be very useful.

Could she not apply for an assistantship?—

22337. The BRUNCE or ROSS.—You complain that the salary of the junior assistant is not a living wage. Would that mean that every junior assistant should get as good a salary as an assistant?—Some of the junior assistants are doing very good work. There is one other case I should like to put in, as illustrating interference with a teacher's methods. This is a case in which a teacher was threatened with dismissal, but the final dismissal examination was not held. I have the teacher's statement here.

22338. Who was the inspector?—Mr. DICKIE. The teacher is Mrs. MARY FITZPATRICK. She was appointed in 1884. The point I want to make is this: this teacher has been in charge of a school; then there is a sudden change, but perhaps I had better read the teacher's own statement:—"January 12th, 1910.—Visited by Dr. Alexander; very angry day; present M. On this day he wrote in the observation book, 'your assistant absent—only one progress book to be kept.' He told me that we need not change until July 1st, and that one syllabus would suffice also. July 11th and 12th, 1910.—Annual inspection by Mr. DICKIE. He told Miss Mulhannan, the assistant, and myself to keep separate progress and syllabus books, and said that we were trying to impose extra work upon him to save ourselves. August 1st, 1910.—Dr. Alexander visited. I told him of Mr. DICKIE's order re progress and syllabus books. He said that it did not matter, to obey Mr. DICKIE. We meant to close the previous Friday for vacation, but owing to a letter from Miss Austin, kindergarten organiser, saying she would call that day we kept open for the day. I was fearfully ill and not able to work, having been in bed all Saturday and Sunday, so I brought no syllabus. I told him all this when he came, and that we only kept open on account of Miss Austin. He admitted that I looked very ill. Then he commenced to abuse me for not having made up the July attendance in the roll book, and checked with report book. He kept on scolding until I almost fainted and had to leave the room. Miss Mulhannan and her sister Teresa (then mistress in Newtownbarry) were present. I have remarked when he wants to be particularly nasty he invariably calls up the other teacher to let her see how little he thinks about me. Since that day the children are so much afraid of him, that they are almost paralysed when an inspector comes."

"March 3rd, 1911.—Dr. Alexander visited. We were using separate progress and syllabus books, and he commenced to abuse me for a whole long hour—saying I should obey him and no one else, unless his orders were countermanded by the manager or chief inspector. I could not get in a word by way of explanation. That evening he wrote to the manager, and also entered in the observation book that I had no work prepared. He refused to examine the books I had."

"July 5th, 1911.—Annual examination by Dr. Alexander. Being fair day in Enniscorthy no child was present in 7th, 8th, or 9th standard. There was one child in the 4th, whom I did not get examined as she has a dreadful impediment in her speech. He changed my report from 'fair' to 'mildling.' Three days after the children were moved into new classes."

4th September, 1913.]

Mr. CON MACSWINEY examined.

[Continued.]

"November 7th, 1911.—Dr. Alexander visited. Miss Mahennan was gone to training, and Miss Mooney, Boalerogue, appointed substitute in her place. He was passably civil that day.

"July 17th, 1912.—Dr. Alexander visited. I asked if he had come for annual inspection, as I had not got the papers. He told me Mr. Dickie would examine, and not to delay taking vacation on account of the examination. I had as one of the lessons for current work in syllabus square and cubic measurements. He asked if I knew how to give the lesson. I answered, 'yes.' He said he never met a teacher who could, and that if I could I was superior to all of them. He then proceeded to make a drawing of rectangle on piece of paper, dividing it up into squares, and after measuring the length, or number of inches, to call each unit a square inch instead of a lineal inch. I said I understood. Then he got fancies, and told me no teacher in his district knew how to teach it. He called up Miss Mooney to listen to his instructions so that she could help me, and told me if he thought I could teach it he would take me into Ennisceorthy, put me in a glass case and make money by exhibiting me. (I have the notes of the same lesson and method, but in much better form, written twelve years ago.) He next asked Miss Mooney to repeat his explanation, so that she could help me when I taught it. She could not, as I think she did not know what he was saying. I explained it then, not from his lecture though, and I firmly believe he was disappointed. These are specimens of Dr. Alexander's manner and bearing towards me, and between himself and Mr. Dickie I do not know what to do; what pleases one displeases the other. One day Mr. Dickie will change the desks at the next visit he changes them back. He gives orders which, when he finds impracticable, he denies having given, or says he was misunderstood. This happens so often, that it is hard to particularise, but I never got a helpful suggestion from either Dr. Alexander or Mr. Dickie.

"October 17th, 1912.—Annual examination by Mr. Dickie, three days after receipt of papers. I never saw him so nasty. He was mooring at both teachers and children the whole day. He came a little after 11 a.m. The children were at arithmetic. He ordered the girls to get their needlework, the boys to play, the infants to come up for examination. The girls once answered everything he asked, except a couple of questions in mental addition, but he was not satisfied because they were not reading from books. The 3rd standard he told to get sheets of paper—then to stand round the room—then to write division with a pencil on these sheets. He gave any arithmetic in all classes, which the children did well and quickly.

From the 3rd up they read very well indeed. At one o'clock he called up the 4th, 5th, and 6th—gave them a letter to write, but when they had only three or four lines down he called them again. He then examined in reading and grammar, and singing and history, and they did very well in each subject. Finally he gave them arithmetic about 2.30—the 4th on their jotters, the others on slates; he never opened the progress book during the day, only inquiring from me every few minutes, 'What have they done in that? How far have they gone in that?' To 6th standard he gave first a sum in fractions—this they did not do. I asked them next day the reason, and they told me they did not know what he said. The next one was decimals—subtraction—what they all did. The next was practice—three got right, one wrong, whose name was stuck off roll, but who turned up that day. Mr. Dickie examined the work of each child for some minutes, then sneered at them, told them to say 'twice times,' that they were all wrong, and could not divide by 2. I gave these excuses to the manager. On January 19th, 1913, I got the report 'mildling' with a notice saying salary would be withdrawn after next examination if school is not improved.

"January 7th, 1913.—Mr. Dickie visited. Told me he thought he did not give a good report, but that the junior (assistant's) classes being backward was the reason. I may mention," she adds, "that every one of these insults and fault-finding have been within the hearing of all the pupils, generally 60 or 70. As a rule, Mr. Dickie's suggestions are verbal, then they are not binding on him. I try to do even the most ridiculous things suggested by him or Dr. Alexander, no matter what trouble and money it costs, and for that very reason I am being crushed, so it is time for me to cry 'hold,' as I have been too slavish, and 'slaves make tyrants.' No matter what any inspector did in my school I never resented it, except once, when Mr. MacMillan was about to strike a child, and again on August 2nd, 1909, Mr. Dickie had a Mr. Thompson with him, who proposed to examine the science class. The class was very good, but he (Mr. Thompson) commenced to ask questions, and at each answer he'd say, 'Oh, that's terrible. Oh, that's dreadful,' although the children were answering splendidly. I listened as long as I could, then I said, 'Mr. Dickie, will you please examine that class, that man is confusing the children.' Mr. Dickie asked what was wrong, though he was listening all the time. I told him, and also that I had the sanction of the Commissioners for what I taught, showing my notebook. Science has never been examined in my school since."

FORTY-EIGHTH DAY.—FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 5TH, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—SIR SAMUEL DILL, B.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman); SIR HIRAM SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; MR. JOHN COFFEY; MR. HENRAGE E. B. HARRISON, B.A.; MR. JEREMIAH HENLY; MR. WALTER MCMURROUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.; and

MR. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

MAJOR DEASE, examined.

22339. THE CHAIRMAN.—I believe you have come here, Major Dease, chiefly to give us some information about the dismissal of Mr. Mansfield?—Yes.

22340. Let me ask you as a matter of fact how long have you been a Commissioner of National Education?—I forget exactly, but about six or seven years.

22341. Have you prepared a statement?—Yes. I think it due to the Committee to offer my evidence to it on the subject of Mr. Mansfield's dismissal. I was

the member of the Board who first proposed it, and the only member who voted for it on the first occasion.

22342. Can you give us the exact date of that occasion?—It is in our minutes.* I do not quite remember the date at this moment. I should like to explain my reasons for having made that motion. I think the correspondence preceding his dismissal has been before the Committee. I don't know whether I would be allowed to read one or two extracts from that

* Vide Appendix LIII.

correspondence. If so, I should like to call attention to the letter dated the 19th August, 1932, in which Mr. Mansfield says: "Somebody has said: 'You cannot catch eels without stirring up mud.' In my capacity as the representative of 10,000 educated men and women, I, in imitation of bigger men, had the hardihood to go a-fishing for educational eels, not indeed in the broad waters of the roaring river, which I understand great men have reserved to themselves, but in the secluded stream of our own private presswork. I was not aware that in these hidden haunts all the mud had already been appropriated. Though I had before me the example of at least one distinguished civil servant who poached publicly in preserved waters, and escaped unscathed, I felt that I could not afford—in considering that there are eight dependent upon me—to take liberally my official life in my hands." Well, I object to the whole tone of that letter, and he goes on to say: "In your haste, you trampled on your own printed rules, and forced me to do the same," and again, "I consider such proceedings unfair, and I am sure the eminent lawyers that adorn your Board cannot but regard it as illegal." And in the letter dated 28th September, in the fourth paragraph, he says: "Your rules, even those I considered silly, I have always respectfully obeyed, and you officials, even the one that has treated me with injustice, distrust, and insult, I have always treated with courtesy and respect." Then there is the reference in the letter of the 1st September: "For me it revives dim memories of a fable in old Aesop, where some animal—a wolf I think it was—played the double part of judge and plaintiff." It has been generally stated that Mr. Mansfield was dismissed for his attack on an inspector. I proposed his dismissal, and that part of his conduct did not influence me in the least. Some of my colleagues seem to think that his letters to the Board were not worth nothing. I, personally, did not take that view. The tone throughout those letters is one of cool and calculated impertinence, that no body of directors of any important business could possibly allow them one of their subordinates, if their authority was to be maintained. If Mr. Mansfield had been an isolated teacher, acting for himself alone, it would have been less serious, and he might have been easily dealt with without such an extreme measure as dismissal, but he could not have been so stupid as to think letters like these worth writing simply to be read and laughed at in our Board room. He wrote as a leading member of the Teachers' Organisation, and the letters were intended for his own audience as much as for us. They would have been read and discussed all over the country, and probably tempted some foolish youngsters to emulate their leader by trying the same sort of thing with their own managers and inspectors, or head teachers, and so get themselves into trouble. Another thing; those letters were only the climax of a movement that had been in progress for a considerable time. For a year or more previous to our action on this point I had heard a good many serious complaints, some from managers, some from responsible teachers, and others in general conversation, of insubordination among teachers. I had also seen in a section of the Press letters written ostensibly by school teachers which would have crippled the whole educational system of the country if the views they expressed had been held by the general body of the teachers. It was therefore important that all responsible people should be made resistent in what they said or did. Mr. Mansfield held an influential position in the Teachers' Organisation, and could not evade the responsibility of that position; and when the correspondence between him and our secretaries had reached the point at which I thought it my duty to propose his dismissal I had come to think that there was considerable risk to any form of authority if summary action was not taken. I am an old soldier, and I know that insubordination is a very catching complaint, and that the harm it does will increase out of all proportion to its beginning if it is not checked in good time. I am still quite sure that if things had gone on from bad to worse for another six months, as they were doing last year, Mr. Mansfield would not have been by any means the only sufferer when an explosion came, and an explosion is a certainty in the

long run at the end of any organised defiance of authority. I would like to add that the most serious point in Mr. Mansfield's first speech, to my mind, was an attack which he made on Dr. Starke by name, and not what he said about the inspector. I suppose that it was owing to this fact—at any rate it was the cause—that Dr. Starke studiously avoided taking any part or expressing any opinion throughout any discussions that took place at our Board on the subject.

22343. Did I understand aright that this matter was twice before the Board?—Yes.

22344. In the first instance, your motion was not carried?—No, I was the only member who voted for it.

22345. Then I believe Mr. Mansfield was ordered to repudiate the things which you have read out?—All except that in the last letter.

22346. On the 15th September Mr. Mansfield was ordered to repudiate the statements attributed to him in the *Clarendon Chronicle*?—Yes, as far as I remember.

22347. Then on the 26th September he declined to do so?—Yes, I think that was the last letter to me.

22348. Your original motion was put to the Board before the 17th September, when he was asked to repudiate these things?—I think it was at that meeting that I proposed his dismissal.

22349. On the 16th October a motion was carried, rebuking him any further recognition?—I don't remember the date.

22350. The *Mirror* or *Rosa*?—Do you remember how many members of the Board were present on the 15th October, when the dismissal of Mr. Mansfield was carried?—No, my Lord.

22351. Can you say in a general way whether it was a large meeting or a small meeting?—I think slightly above the average. The attendance has been very good for the last two or three years.

22352. Was there a division upon the question? Was there a vote taken?—I suppose there was a vote taken. Yes, I believe there was a vote.

22353. Do you remember what was the voting upon that occasion?—As far as I remember—I would not like to say positively—I think Mr. Ward was the only member present who voted against the dismissal on the occasion on which Mr. Mansfield was dismissed.

22354. And the others all voted for your proposition?—As a matter of fact, the proposal on which he was dismissed at the last meeting was a motion by Lord Chief Baron Pollock, and not by me. I proposed it at the first meeting, but the Chief Baron took the thing up the second time. I do not think he was present at the previous meeting, but I think the motion was in the Chief Baron's name when he was dismissed.

22355. Would it not be desirable that we should have those particulars. I think it would be desirable to supplement your evidence by getting the members present and the numbers who voted for and against the motion?—These could be got from our Minutes.

22356. Would you obtain that information* and send it in as a supplement to your evidence?—Certainly.

22357. The CHAIRMAN.—I think that it would be convenient, as you are not quite sure that you are right about the date of your first proposal of his dismissal?—Yes.

22358. And the dates of the various occasions when the question was discussed, and the number of times and the dates upon which it was discussed?—Yes.

22359. If it is in the Minutes?—Oh, yes, it is all in the Minutes.

22360. And the members who voted for and against on the 16th October?—Yes, I understand, and all the meetings at which the question was discussed, because the thing was going on for a considerable length of time.

22361. The *Banner* or *Rosa*?—I think it would be desirable to get the dates of the meetings at which the question was discussed?—It was going on before from time to time.

22362. It would be desirable to know the number of times it was up, to see whether the Board acted hastily or deliberately?—Yes, but, of course, there was no motion put to the Board, or division taken, except on two occasions. I know, positively I was the only

* Vide Appendix LIII.

22d September, 1915.]

MAJOR DEANE examined.

[Continued.]

member who voted for it the first time. Would you like to know the number of members present at these meetings?

The Manager of Hoses.—Yes.

22363. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—I am an old Civil Servant, Major Deane, and you will not assume in any question I put to you that I am attempting to justify the propriety of any language used by Mr. Mansfield, but I want to put the matter fairly as the case occurs to me, and I ask you whether Mr. Mansfield was not taken at a disadvantage in having a communication sent to him out of the ordinary course of the Board's procedure, calling upon him to answer directly a question put by the Board?—Calling upon him to answer a question put by the Board?

Yes, instead of sending it through his manager.

The Chairman.—I think it would be well, Sir Herman, if you direct Major Deane's attention to the rule to which you refer.

22364. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Yes, I am referring to Rule 95a?—Yes, I see. Rule 95 (a) says: "The Communications, as a rule, do not correspond directly with the teachers, except as provided in Rules 69, 90, and 98;" but you see we leave it open to ourselves to communicate directly on occasions when we consider it necessary to do so.

22365. But don't you think that Mr. Mansfield was placed at a disadvantage by that exercise of your discretion, I put it to you in this way: supposing that a young lieutenant in the Army had been alleged to have been guilty of some impropriety, would not a communication from headquarters, in regard to that young lieutenant's conduct, have gone through yourself or the colonel? Would not that young lieutenant be in a much better position having the communication made through the colonel or yourself? Would it not be a great advantage to the lieutenant to have the advice of yourself or the colonel before sending back his answer?—I do not know. After all, you got a certain question which requires a certain answer, and I do not see it makes much difference whether it comes straight from your own hands or through the hands of another person.

22366. It occurs to me, and may possibly have occurred to you, that when a junior has sent in a reply to be forwarded, and those over him having exercised their authority, and pointed out to him certain matters in his reply which, without changing the substance, might change the form and make it much better for the junior, in these circumstances that the junior would be less likely to suffer by his answer?—Which particular letter would that refer to?

22367. The Chairman.—I think Sir Herman is referring to the telegram sent to Mr. Mansfield?—He was asked to tell us whether he was accurately reported in his attack on the senior inspector.

22368. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—That was on the 16th August. No reply was received, and as the matter was coming before the Board on Tuesday a telegram was sent to Mr. Mansfield. No reply having been received from the manager, you communicated direct with Mr. Mansfield by telegram, calling upon him to answer a letter addressed to the manager?—We called upon him to say whether he was accurately reported in the paragraph headed "Senior Inspector in the General Chronicle."

22369. No, no! The manager was asked to forward to the Education Office Mr. Mansfield's observations?—Yes.

22370. Then this repudiation was asked for direct: that is the point—to be sent direct by Mr. Mansfield to the Board, and I suggest to you that if you followed the usual practice, and allowed the correspondence to go through the manager, who is an experienced clergyman, that Mr. Mansfield would have been put in a much better position than he was in, and that he would have been less likely to use language which nobody would say was justifiable?—In that case we would have had to wait for another fortnight before dealing with the case. That telegram was sent because it was the only means of getting any reply from Mr. Mansfield, and we only meet once a fortnight.

22371. Do you consider that in an incident of that kind a fortnight is too long to wait?—What is the date of the original speech?

22372. The Chairman.—The speech was made on the 12th July, 1913?—As far as my opinion is worth anything, I think he had plenty of time.

22373. On the 2nd August, 1913, the manager of the Cullen school, the Very Rev. Dr. O'Neill, P.P., was informed that the attention of the Commissioners had been called to the speech of Mr. Mansfield, and he was asked to obtain and forward to the Education Office Mr. Mansfield's observations in regard to it for consideration?—Yes, that was on the 2nd August.

22374. Well, a fortnight passed, and on Friday, the 10th August, as no reply had been received, and as the matter was coming before the Board on the 20th August, a telegram in the following terms was sent to Mr. Mansfield:—"Your observations called for in an official letter of the 2nd inst. to Rev. Dr. O'Neill, requested immediately?"—What was the date of the letter to the manager?

22375. The 2nd August?—Very well. Between the 2nd August and the 10th August what happened to that letter?

22376. I am not to account for that, but you had written to the manager, and you might have written to the manager again, or telegraphed to him, and that would be the ordinary course to follow in your official proceedings?—Well, I suppose probably we had not got an answer from the manager. The reason that telegram was sent to him seems to me, and it is shown in the evidence, that we wanted to have something definite for our meeting of the 20th August. Otherwise we should have had to wait until the first meeting in September.

22377. Would that have been a very serious delay?—Well, we are often much troubled with delays, with questions hanging on about meeting to meeting.

22378. I think from your experience as an officer you will know that a junior who is deprived of the benefit of the supervision of his immediate superiors in his communications with headquarters is placed at a very serious disadvantage through inexperience?—There is a difference between a junior lieutenant and a man like Mr. Mansfield, with his position and experience.

22379. I am afraid you can scarcely compare the occurrence of a gentleman in Mr. Mansfield's position with the experience which a clergyman, acquainted with the world, would have?—That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. HENLY.—The manager was on holidays.

The Chairman.—That is so.

Mr. HENLY.—There is no evidence that Mr. Mansfield got the letter at all.

22380. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—I suggest he was placed at a great disadvantage, and in putting my question I hope you will understand that I am not trying to blame the Board for what they did, but to fairness to Mr. Mansfield, I was pointing out the difficult position in which he was placed, being a man who certainly had not the experience which you would attribute to him?—That is a matter of opinion.

22381. Well, now, I suggest to you he was placed at a disadvantage?—Still it is a matter of opinion.

22382. I think if he had the advantage of conferring with Canon O'Neill that you probably would not have been troubled with a letter such as you receive?—It is quite possible, but I don't think it probable.

22383. You must remember that that letter would have come through Canon O'Neill, and though I do not know what your experience in such matters has been, it is certainly my experience, extending over a long time, that I have seen many cases in which juniors have been saved from indiscretion by having to send their communications through their immediate superior officers?—It is quite possible.

22384. Another thing I would like to ask you. As you have come here frankly, and stated that it was due to you that the initial proceedings were taken, I would ask you to consider whether the matter might not be again considered by your Board. I do not ask for an answer to that at the present moment. I merely make that suggestion. I have no doubt you will

consider whether it is possible?—As far as I am personally concerned, speaking for myself, I would be very glad, indeed, if Mr. Mansfield was reinstated. I have no personal feeling against Mr. Mansfield. I simply acted in the interest of authority.

22385. If I may say so, I do not think that there is any member of this Committee who thinks for a moment that there was any sincerity at all displayed towards Mr. Mansfield by any member of the Board, and if I may say so, as an old Civil Servant, I think Mr. Mansfield's letter was one which might fairly call for action on the part of the Board—I will put it in that way. But it appears in another case, where a teacher acted in a similar way, the Board took another course. They sent down two chiefs of inspection to hold an investigation. We have it in evidence that that was the course taken by the Board, and we find that these two chief inspectors put the matter before the teacher, and made the teacher see where he was in error, and got him to write to the Board, and say he was indiscreet. We will not go into the full particulars, but that was done in a recent case?—I suppose it was in the discretion of the Board to treat one case upon its merits, and the other case also upon its merits.

22386. There is no suggestion that because you did a certain thing upon a certain occasion that you are bound always to act in the same way, but I am suggesting that in that case the teacher was saved from the consequences of his own acts, and in the other case the teacher was placed in a very disadvantageous position and suffered for his acts?—Yes, but he was dismissed on the 15th October. We spent from the date of that first speech at Clonmel, which was some time in June, until October, giving him every possible chance that we could devise for withdrawing his statement, and he went on accumulating additional offences.

22387. You quite understand there is no one here who would contend for a moment that Mr. Mansfield acted in accordance with the rules which ought to govern your service, and I want to point out to you, that in making the suggestion of his re-instatement, I am not making it on behalf of the Committee, though I dare say the Committee may agree in that with me, but his re-instatement is not a matter with which the Committee has to deal.

The CHAIRMAN.—It is quite beyond our terms of reference.

Sir HYMAN WILKINSON.—But as you come before as I think it right to put that consideration before you, and I hope you will look upon it in that light?—Oh, yes.

22388. Mr. HENLY.—You thought that Mr. Mansfield should be dismissed for the tone of his letter?—That is why I proposed his dismissal—that is all I know about it.

22389. But what was he dismissed for?—For the position he took up of incandescence and insubordination to his superiors.

22390. I do not think that is so?—I am simply giving evidence here as to the reason why I proposed his dismissal.

22391. Well, now, it is said here that the case was again before the Commissioners on the 17th September, when the following order was made:—"That Mr. Mansfield be requested to repudiate publicly the statement attributed to him in the *Clonmel Chronicle* of the 17th July, 1912, with reference to the senior inspector?"—Yes.

22392. And when he refused to repudiate it he was dismissed?—Yes.

22393. It appears from that order of the Board that he had repudiated the statement which alluded to Mr. Weirly he would not have been dismissed?—If Mr. Mansfield had repudiated the statement on that date he would not have written important letters on several days afterwards, on the strength of which I proposed his dismissal.

22394. Oh, no! That order was made on the 17th September?—Yes.

22395. And the letter to which you object was written on the 19th August?—What is the date of that last letter?

The CHAIRMAN.—We have not got the date when Mayor Dease proposed his dismissal. That is unclear.

22396. Mr. HENLY.—The Board Order was for not repudiating the attack on the senior inspector?—Well, you see a thing of that sort was not an isolated action. The state of things at the earlier date was such that I was, I think, the only member of Board who considered that Mr. Mansfield ought to be dismissed; but then on the 29th September there was this additional letter written with others, and his savage attack upon Dr. Stickle, all these things were accumulating, but it was not until the letter of the 29th September was read that the majority of the Board decided upon his dismissal.

22397. Upon what rule of the Board was he dismissed?—I do not really know the exact rule, but I suppose there is a rule under which subordinates of any department or business or large concern are expected to show some kind of civility to their superiors.

22398. Is it not rather a large order to dismiss a man and deprive him of his career in life on the assumption that there is somewhere a rule dealing with the case when we have got rules existing for a great many objects?—I think ordinary common sense would tell anybody that, without any code or rules.

22399. But surely upon a matter of that kind dealing with the dismissal of a teacher, where you have several rules dealing with the subject, one would like to know which was followed in that correspondence?—Well, I am quite sure the rule is there. I do not know whether you would like me to take up the time of the Committee reading through all the rules, but I cannot put my finger on the particular rule at the present moment.

22400. You are not aware of it?—I am pretty sure it is in the code.

22401. Are you aware of the rule that would warrant his dismissal in the first instance?—I have been so much aware of the rule ever since I joined the Board as I am at the present moment. I refer to a rule when I want it to bear upon a particular matter. I do not carry all the rules in my head.

22402. The CHAIRMAN.—The rules upon the conduct of teachers commence with rule 90?—Rule 90 (1) says—"Teachers who have declined in efficiency, or who have conducted themselves improperly, are dealt with as the Commissioners determine."

22403. Mr. HARRISON.—Who have conducted themselves improperly?—It is ordinary common sense. Of course, you cannot run any business otherwise.

22404. Mr. HENLY.—May I ask you another question. Do you remember the case of the Dolphin's Barn teacher, recently dismissed after thirty-four years' service?—Does that refer to Mr. Mansfield?

22405. It does not?—Then I should like to know if the Committee will wish me to answer irrelevant questions upon other points, because the letter I had from the Secretary of this Committee invited me to give evidence with reference to a particular point only, namely, the dismissal of Mr. Mansfield. Of course, I am prepared to answer any question the members of the Committee ask.

22406. The CHAIRMAN.—I think it rests with yourself to say if you will answer any questions outside that particular matter. It is a matter for yourself entirely?—I shall be happy to answer any questions put to me.

22407. You are a voluntary witness, of course?—I will answer any questions you like.

22408. Mr. HENLY.—I was asking you do you remember the case of the Dolphin's Barn teacher dismissed by order of your Board?—Mrs. Connelly and Mrs. Burke?—I remember a question of some teachers of Dolphin's Barn, but I do not remember the particular circumstances.

22409. There is a very important point in connection with this. It says in your rules, 93 (3)—"In no case is a teacher dismissed for inefficiency on the reports of a single inspector; before recognition is finally withdrawn, his work is tested by means of a thorough inspection of the school as a whole, and an examination of all the standards for whose instruction the teacher is responsible?"—Yes.

22410. "This inspection is conducted by one of the senior or chief inspectors, and in the presence of one of the Commissioners, if they think it desirable?"—Yes.

22411. Are you aware, or have you satisfied yourself that the senior inspector, who visited that school, both inspected the school, and held an examination of all the standards for whose instruction the teacher is responsible?—I could not tell you. I do not remember the case being before the Board. I may not have been present.

22412. I have consulted the document laid before the Board, upon which they were dismissed, and in reading down that report I can find no evidence that the pupils were examined, and, therefore, if these teachers were dismissed on inspection merely, and not inspection plus examination of all the children, would it not be illegal according to these rules?—I should not like to give an opinion one way or the other upon a case of that sort unless I knew the exact circumstances. I do not carry the case in my head.

22413. Would it not be illegal to dismiss a teacher if the school was only inspected?—Apparently from these rules, but I really could not say positively. I should not like to give an opinion without knowing all the circumstances. I cannot carry all these things in my head.

22414. I am only asking this question, supposing a teacher was dismissed, and there was only inspection, and not examination, would not that be illegal?—Apparently.

22415. As far as we have evidence, these schools were inspected, but not examined. The pupils were not examined in the thorough manner referred to in that rule?—Possibly.

22416. We asked questions of Dr. Starke and Mr. Lomas on the subject?—Oh, they would know more about it than I do. I would not like to give any answer one way or the other upon that point, without knowing the circumstances of the case. I may not have been at the Board meeting.

22417. May I ask you a question with reference to an article you have written, entitled, "The Commission of Drawing," in which you say, "Of course, the Board forbids any writing by children under six years of age?"—Yes.

22418. Where is that forbidden?—Dr. Starke told me first, in private conversation, and I think that good enough.

22419. You think that good enough?—Yes, quite.

22420. Now, here we have a programme laid down by your Board, "writing small letters, imitating model writing," and here we have in the report issued by your Board, with your authority, "pupils under six amount to 105,157," and then we are told later on that "the total number of pupils is 679,600," and out of this, 105,157 are under six; and I will show you further that the whole 679,000, including those between five and six, are learning reading and spelling and writing and composition, and even grammar?—I am very sorry to hear it.

22421. Do you display an accurate knowledge of the working of the Board in these articles?—In these articles which I have written I stated at the very beginning of them that they were entirely an expression of my own opinion, and had no sanction or reference to the Board.

22422. I admit that, but you said the Board forbids the teaching of writing to pupils under six?—Dr. Starke told me that.

22423. Is it true?—I do not know, really.

22424. You cannot accept your own report, then?—I do not know about the rule. I know quite well that children under six do write sometimes.

22425. There is your own programme. I want your attention to another statement. You say you would make it a penal offence to allow any child to learn that such a thing as a "pet-book" ever existed. And you go on to say—"I would prescribe boiling oil for anybody who let any child attempt a written word till he has reached his seventh birthday." Have you prepared the boiling oil for the rest of the Commissioners?—That is trifling.

22426. You are a member of the Board since 1905?—Is that the date?

22427. I have it here?—I take your word for it.

22428. And you say, with reference to the teachers, in a letter you sent to the Tablet—"I can safely say there is not a man amongst the members of the Board who has not got more experience, more knowledge of the world, and of men, and the forces of education, than Miss Mahon and I follow." Is that the proper way to refer to teachers for whose training you and the Board are responsible?—Have you got a copy of the Tablet previous to that, with statements in it attributed to Miss Mahon, and have you got a copy of the Schoolmaster containing an article over Miss Mahon's name from which the Tablet had made extracts?

22429. Mr. HENLEY.—I have not?—Then I decline to give any answer until I have these things before me.

22430. Mr. ALANSON.—Would you tell me on what ground did the Board reject your first proposal with regard to Mr. Mansfield?—I suppose they thought his behaviour had not been sufficiently serious.

22431. Was it on that ground, or in order to give him time to withdraw?—I think that very likely. We had been giving him time from meeting to meeting.

22432. You do not know?—I do not know what was in their mind.

22433. I presume there was some debate?—We discussed the thing, but I do not think that that point was mentioned.

22434. You cannot recall the ground upon which your proposal was rejected?—I could not possibly say what was in the minds of the other Commissioners.

22435. On what ground was it ultimately resolved to dismiss him; was that made quite clear?—Would not that be in the minutes?

22436. I do not know if it was quite clear, but I thought you might possibly throw some light upon it. Of course, you see there was sufficient reason in my mind, and, I suppose, in that of the other Commissioners, because of his offence. He had attacked the inspector in a rather insolent way, and he attacked Dr. Starke personally by name in the same speech in a very reprehensible way, as we all thought, and then there was letter after letter written. We were giving him every opportunity of retracting all through, and each time, instead of retracting, he was adding to what I considered his offence, by writing more and more impudent letters.

22437. It was not specifically stated on what particular ground he was dismissed?—Unless it is in the minutes it certainly was not. Might I say that before the question was put to the vote I gave my views to my colleagues, and I dwell entirely upon the aspect of his insubordination, and pointed out that I considered that this insubordination was becoming serious all over the country, and that some sort of check ought to be put to it. So that I think it was that question of insubordination that probably was chiefly in the minds of my colleagues.

22438. General insubordination?—Yes. Of course, I cannot say beyond that.

22439. Referring to Article 50 (1). Have you any doubt that this Article, which states that teachers who decline in efficiency, or conducted themselves improperly, see dealt with as the Commissioners determine, gives you power to dismiss Mr. Mansfield?—Absolutely none.

22440. It is perfectly clear?—We could not carry on our work otherwise.

22441. I think all cases of dismissal are placed upon the agenda of the Board? Are they not?—Yes.

22442. Am I right in assuming that the general practice in this case is to accept the decision that has been arrived at, and recommended by the administrative staff without discussion?—No; not in a case in which the teacher considers he is unfairly dealt with. He would, I think, be almost sure to make an application to some Commissioner personally, whom he knows something about.

22443. Would there be cases where the dismissal was for inefficiency?—I think in any case. I have had applications made to me personally.

22444. But there is a very great difference between cases where inefficiency is alleged, and where there is some other offence which might be called an offence against morality?—Yes.

22445. Do you distinguish between those cases?—Oh, yes.

22446. And where the dismissal is for inefficiency is there, as a rule, any discussion with the Board or not?—Well, there is a sheet printed—I don't know whether you have seen the paper—stating the whole course which has been pursued by the Inspector in respect of the case, and, of course, this is sent to every member of the Board and read by us.

22447. My point is: Is there any general discussion or is the recommendation generally accepted that accompanies these cases?—I think it is very seldom discussed, because it is so obvious that discussion would be waste of time. I can tell you most positively since I have been at the Board that in any case that has come before me, any teacher who has been suspended for inefficiency ought to have been suspended in the interest of the children a long time before.

22448. That is as the case presents itself to your mind?—Certainly.

22449. And in that case yours is a lay mind?—Yes.

22450. You and most of your members cannot be experts, ready to decide whether a teacher is inefficient or not?—Well, you see our inspectors, as experienced people, give us a statement of their procedure.

22451. Then it practically comes to this: You feel you have no alternative but to accept their recommendations?—I should not say that for a moment.

22452. Can you tell me any case where you have not done so?—I could not tell you off-hand.

22453. Can you recall any case where these recommendations have been challenged seriously?—I think I myself have recalled that a teacher should be given another chance. I know I have; that is in cases that have been before us for dismissal.

22454. Was that owing to personal appeals made to yourself or because there was something which appeared to you unsatisfactory?—I think it would be probably tempering justice with mercy.

22455. There would be a personal application made to you?—A written application from a teacher I had never seen.

22456. Is it not rather unsatisfactory that personal applications should be made to members of the Board?—I am afraid that that will be always done whether it is right or not.

22457. The CHAIRMAN.—It would tax your ingenuity to prevent it?

Mr. HENDERSON.—It is unsatisfactory.

Witness.—The teachers are satisfied all over the country, and all teachers know a little more about the Commissioner from their own part than about the other Commissioners, and they write a statement to him. I get them every day.

22458. The CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Philip Ward told us he has about 2,000 letters a year?—Oh, I am sure he has.

22459. Mr. CORRY.—In the statement you made you referred to the dismissal of Mr. Mansfield as the climax of agitation?—Yes.

22460. What was the cause of the agitation and of matters coming to a climax?—Well, I could not tell you what was in the mind of people agitating—a great many things, I think.

22461. What do you think led to the climax at that particular time?—Mr. Mansfield's dismissal.

22462. Mr. Mansfield's speech led up to his dismissal?—That was the starting-point; but, of course, if he had withdrawn that speech, or qualified it, or made any statement which he was requested to do by the Board in the first instance, the whole thing would have stopped, but instead he wrote impudent letters.

22463. I am not for one moment going to defend the tone or spirit of his letters to the Board, but we have it admitted by official evidence here, that the Commissioners now see, or the office at all events now recognise, that the teachers in the Clonmel circuit had good reason to complain; that is admitted here?—Is it?

22464. And that being admitted that they had good reason to complain, they had no other way to get the attention of the Commissioners except by public speeches?—Hain't they? They had the same way as any other teachers. The teachers have complete access to the Board at any time.

22465. To the Commissioners?—Certainly. They can write an any complaint they have to make.

22466. The CHAIRMAN.—Might I ask you, Major Dennis, whether you are aware that before the thing became public that there was a great variation in the marking in the circuit in Clonmel?—Oh, yes.

22467. That the marking had become much more severe?—Oh, yes.

22468. Mr. HENDERSON.—Not before the agitation?—I could not tell you the exact dates; but we knew Mr. Welpy was marking more severely than his predecessor, Mr. Brown.

22469. Mr. CORRY.—When did that come to your knowledge?—Everybody at the Board knew that.

22470. When?—I don't know. I am sure I could not give the date, but I don't suppose there was any members of the Board who did not know.

22471. Was it before Mr. Mansfield's dismissal?—Oh, yes.

22472. Were you aware before Mr. Mansfield's dismissal that Mr. Welpy was marking more severely than Mr. Brown?—Oh, yes. As far as I can see, I am pretty certain we all knew that before Mr. Mansfield's original speech at Clonmel.

22473. The CHAIRMAN.—Were you one of the Commissioners who urged Dr. Sturkie to go down and investigate the thing personally in 1911?—Was he urged to go down?

22474. So he says; that some of the Commissioners urged him to go down and investigate the state of the Clonmel circuit?—I don't remember.

Is was not a resolution of the Board?

Mr. KAVANAGH.—No; he gave the names of Mr. Ward and another.

22475. The CHAIRMAN.—You know of the visit to the Clonmel circuit?—Yes.

22476. Mr. CORRY.—You know that some teachers appealed to the Board for re-inspection, and that their appeals were refused? Are you aware they got no redress?—As far as I remember the circumstances, I don't think any application or appeal was made by any of those teachers until a considerable time after the inspection had taken place.

22477. Mr. CORRY.—There was, and that is what forced them into making a joint application. We have had evidence of appeals sent up, and no action taken on them, and of appeals that were refused?—I don't know anything about that.

22478. Mr. CORRY.—Did any appeals concerning individual teachers that involved re-inspection ever come before the Board?—Appeals made to the Board direct by teachers or through the manager?

22479. Have you any recollection of appeals against the marking of inspectors ever coming before the Commissioners and a demand for re-inspection?—I cannot say. I do not remember at this moment.

22480. Rule 95 says: "Should a teacher have any well-grounded cause of complaint against the manager or the inspector he may submit his case in writing directly to the Commissioners for their consideration?"—Oh, certainly; why not?

22481. But numbers of appeals have come since you became a Commissioner; have one of those appeals, to your knowledge, ever reached the Commissioners?—I cannot say that; I don't remember.

22482. As a matter of fact, we have it from Dr. Sturkie that since January, 1906, owing to a resolution of the Board, it has not been necessary for him to bring these appeals before the Commissioners, and that the appeals now rest with himself. In connection with that, I want to put it to you, as a public man, of great standing in this country, do you think it does not place the Commissioners of National Education in rather an invidious position, that while under this rule the teachers have a right, as you say they have a right, to appeal to the Commissioners, that by a private resolution of January, 1909, which does not appear in the rules, the Commissioners should hand over that power to the Resident Commissioner?—I did not hand it over. I never heard of it until this moment.

22483. I quite understand you did not hear of it, but we have evidence that this power was handed over in January, 1909, and since then no appeals have come before the Commissioners?—Have they not?

22484. Mr. CORRY.—No?—You mean the Resident Commissioner has power while the Board is not sitting?

22485. The CHAIRMAN.—He claims that himself?—I think that has been recognised, because otherwise the work would not be done. I mean administration and all that sort of thing.

22486. Mr. CORRY.—Apart from any question of that, what I suggest to you is this, that there is a certain suggestion almost of impropriety in giving a right of appeal to the Commissioners when those appeals don't go to the Commissioners?—I daresay if any teacher chooses to appeal to the Commissioners under that rule he can appeal to the Commissioners; there is not the slightest doubt about it.

22487. We have had it admitted?—I know nothing about the admission.

22488. You will find when you come to read Dr. Starke's evidence that all these appeals never go before the Commissioners?—Probably if Dr. Starke was perfectly satisfied in his own mind that an appeal was not, I won't say frivolous, but had sufficient force, and should not be dealt with by himself alone, he would unquestionably put it before the Board. He would much sooner, in any question of that kind, throw the responsibility upon the Board. He has got responsibility enough without incurring more.

22489. What I suggest to you is the desirability of making it clear, and in place of saying in the rule, "Submit his case in writing to the Commissioners," substitute the words, "Submit his case in writing to the Resident Commissioner"?—Certainly not. If the Board chooses to delegate its authority to the Resident Commissioner to deal with ordinary cases, there is no reason that we should give up our authority in extraordinary cases. Any teacher in Ireland can appeal to the Board.

22490. Direct to the Commissioners?—Certainly.

Mr. CORRY.—These appeals do not come to the Commissioners; they are addressed to the Commissioners, but they do not reach the Commissioners.

22491. Mr. HENRY.—They are intercepted by a private regulation of your own?—There is such a thing as administration, and a Board that meets once a fortnight cannot have the whole of the correspondence for a fortnight put before it to read. We should have to sit at a table all the year round if we were to deal with every single application.

22492. This is only the case of appeals?—You are speaking about appeals now. You may speak of other things in time. You will find that if any teacher wishes to apply to the Board direct, and states in the application that he wishes it to go before the Board it would be put before the Board.

22493. Mr. CORRY.—The manager of a school, the Parish Priest or Rector, writes to the Secretary of the Board complaining of the merit mark of his school, and appealing to the Board for re-inspection?—Who would you like him to address his letter to?

22494. But in writing to the Secretary he intends it to go to the Commissioners in the terms of the rule, and now we have it, it does not go to the Commissioners?—Every single case would not go to the Commissioners. Teachers send applications to me personally.

22495. I don't think that is quite regular; they should go to the Secretary?—If I consider the application a teacher makes to me is worth looking into on the face of it—some of them are not—I take it to one of the Secretaries to look into the case for me. If any teacher in Ireland applies to have his case considered by the Board under that rule it will be considered by the Board.

22496. Would you care to offer any opinion in connection with the statement made by Dr. Starke in regard to the Board?—What was that?

22497. He says anyone who expects consistency from a Board may be written down as an ass; that is from any Board except a paid Board, responsible for the performance of their duty. It is rather a hard hit at your present Board to say it is not consistent?—I should be sorry to lay odds on finding consistency amongst any twenty men you could get together, especially in this country.

22498. You said Dr. Starke took no part in Mr. Mansfield's dismissal?—As far as I remember, Dr. Starke said, as my name has been introduced into Mr. Mansfield's speech, I prefer to say nothing about it, or words to that effect. He steadily refrained from having anything to say to the discussions. I think, probably, he did not vote, but I could not say positively. You will see that in the minutes.

FORTY-NINTH DAY.—TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9TH, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

PRESENT:—Sir SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.B. (Chairman); The Most Rev. DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross; Sir HIRAM SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN COSTEY; Mr. HENRAGE E. B. HARRISON, B.A.; Mr. JEREMIAS HENLY; Mr. WALTER MCMURROUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.

and Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Miss CATHERINE M. MAHON, President, National Teachers' Organisation, examined.

22502. The CHAIRMAN.—Your evidence is divided into three parts, and as I understand the first part of your proof is not ready, we propose to go on with the part which you have ready. You are principal of the Carrig Giff's School?—The Carrig Mixed School.

22503. How many years have you been in the service of the Board?—Since 1892.

22504. Did you enter as a trained teacher?—No, I was a novice in the Birr Convent first, then I taught with the nuns for another year, the first part of the year in Tuilla, Co. Clare, and the remainder of the year in Nenagh. Then I got a little school at Glencallo, and was there for six months when I got this mixed school in my own native place.

22505. How long have you been there?—Since 1902.

22506. You have got an assistant?—Yes, since 1908.

I taught the school alone until 1906, when the average required for an assistant was reduced from 60 to 50. The average in my school was never much more than 50.

22507. It is more than 60 now?—It is not more than 60; it has gone down to something about 48. The population is decreasing, and there are not so many children as there were years ago in our parish.

22508. What is your grade?—Second grade. I want to tell you that in 1898 I went to training and I put a substitute in my place. I went for a year and came out in 1899. Teachers in the service were allowed a one year course. I went into training second class and came out first class. In 1900, when the grade system was introduced, I was depressed from first class to second grade because our school is in a poor district and I did not charge much school fees.

less, and that lowered the salary. My salary, therefore, only entitled my school to second grade. I was really looking forward to first grade, but a year and a half ago again the average went down below 50, and I cannot now get back, by my average, my old qualifications ever again.

22505. You got increments!—Yes; I am on the maximum of second grade for about four and a half years.

22507. So your reports must have been good all through!—My reports were good except one year. Some years ago I had a difference with an inspector, and the next year my report went down to "fair."

22508. When you got that report "fair" did it affect your increment!—Yes; I lost my increment for that year.

22509. Mr. CORVER.—For that triennial period?—No, for that year.

22510. That is the marks went on to the following year, and you then got your increment! That is the system Dr. Sharke said he introduced?—I do not know that, but I know that until we got rid of that inspector I did not get my increment, and when he went I got it the next month. We made a big row and got him away.

22511. The CHAIRMAN.—Now you want to tell us first of all the relationship of the inspectors to the teachers. You describe them as "instruments of the administration obeying orders." I suppose you mean by that to say that the administration is responsible for the grievance of the teachers as to inspection?—With regard to inspectors I wish to emphasise the fact that I deal with them as the instruments of the administration which I have described in Part I. of my Statement.* Harsh inspectors must necessarily bear the blame of their individual acts, but to fix on them as a body any responsibility for the sins of the system would be analogous to an incident I recall of the hunt-stopping days, where the master of the forbearance was allowed to ride by un molested, and the poor whipper-in and his dogs set upon and beaten. Inspectors are just what the administration makes them. If they get clear, definite instructions, and were given to understand they should obey them, there would be no trouble with them. But instead of that they get circular essays in the shape of circulars which contain nothing practical which no one can definitely interpret, or rather which each one can interpret as he wishes, and which give them no guide towards forming a judgment. Against that, they know very definitely the practice among those inspectors who find favour in the office, and if they want favour also, the temptation is to go and act accordingly. So I repeat it is the administration, and as the administration is solely in the hands of the Resident Commissioner since 1907, it is the Resident Commissioner who is solely responsible for the inspectional grievances of the teachers under the new system.

22512. You say these circulars don't contain definite advice—not sufficiently definite you mean?—Not sufficiently definite, and more or less contradictory, and the spirit of the office is not in keeping at all with the apparent spirit of the circular. For instance, it is like this. The circular enjoins friendly relations between the inspectors and the teachers, and if the teacher makes a complaint of the want of those relations or that the inspector is arbitrary the teacher gets no fair play, and the inspector is backed up by the office.

22513. The number of inspectors whose conduct to the teachers has been strongly criticised here is comparatively small. Is it true of the most of the inspectors that they are acting in this way? Is the complaint about the great body of the inspectors? You, as President of the Teachers' Organisation can form an idea!—There are complaints from almost every part of Ireland from individual teachers about the acts of inspectors. From all parts of Ireland we have had complaints of inspectional discourtesy and arrogance, and of the dominating spirit and manner with which teachers are being treated. And unfortunately this is felt more by women teachers, because I think they are more timid and more easily frightened by this dominating spirit over them than men are.

22514. Your information leads you to conclude that this is general?—It does; there are a few noble exceptions. We have an inspector at present, Mr. Bradshaw, and no teacher could possibly find fault with Mr. Bradshaw—he is one of the exceptions.

22515. I knew him long ago; he is an old pupil of mine!—I have been Chairman of the County Association and have met all the teachers of the county, from Mullingar to Edenderry, and they are of the same mind about Mr. Bradshaw, and they all say that if all the inspectors were like him there would be no need for an inquiry to-day. He is one exception.

22516. How long has he been in your district?—For a great number of years now. I fear we shall soon lose him.

22517. The next point is, you want to compare the old style of inspection with the new!—Yes. Though teachers are, in the very nature of things more or less fearful of an inspector, yet before 1900 a spirit of camaraderie and confidence existed to a very large extent between teacher and inspector, and the defective spirit did not prevail to any noticeable extent. The degeneracy of the inspection staff into a force of educational police and the deterioration of inspectional courtesy has been mainly a development of the new system of surprise inspection. An old inspector, Mr. Allman, lived in Birr, which was then a centre, in the 'eighties. He never met a woman teacher in the street but he took off his hat and saluted her as if she were a duchess. His house was the rendezvous for teachers every Saturday, seeking advice in all their difficulties. Yet he was a strict, punctilious examiner, and cold and reserved in manner, but he possessed the teachers' confidence, and was their guide and friend, and it was the rule at the time for teachers to confide in the inspector with a view to getting his expert advice. Another inspector that had to do a good deal with Birr district was Mr. Parson, afterwards head and then chief. He had the reputation of being scrupulously exact about every aspect of school work, records, etc. Yet he was universally respected and esteemed by the teachers, and a more charming man with children never stood on the floor of the schoolroom. They were never rebuffed or chilled or disheartened in their timid little efforts to answer his questions, and he drew out the best that was in them.

22518. Was he regarded as a strict inspector?—Yes, he had the reputation of being strict, but still he was universally respected and esteemed for his charming manners with the little children. If a child did not pass with him it was not through fear or want of encouragement. Since 1900 the inspectors have totally changed in their bearing towards the teachers and treat them in an arrogant and despotic way, as if they were a sort of subordinate to be dominated over, and "put in their places" in presence of their pupils, and courtesy both in school and outside with them seems an "eight" deadly sin.

22519. Mr. CORVER.—How do you account for that in view of the fact that the circulars from the office are now more impressive about the respect due to the teachers, than were the circulars in the old times?—I am stating the facts, and they have been universally observed by the teachers, especially by those teachers who have had experience of the two systems. I know myself it is the spirit of the administration. I deal later on with the class from which the inspectors are recruited and their method of selection.

22520. The CHAIRMAN.—Do you think the inspectors now are drawn from a different class than they were before 1907?—I do.

22521. Do you mean as regards culture?—No, I would not say at all as regards culture. I say they are drawn from a different class socially. Before 1900 the teachers had more opportunities of getting into the inspectional than now; that would be one reason; and then men that came in from outside teaching bodies had to mix with men recruited from the teachers, and they got to be more liberal and democratic in their spirit. They seem to have now a sort of aristocratic spirit amongst them.

22522. You think the inspectors are drawn from a socially higher class?—I would not call them socially higher.

22523. I thought that was what you meant—a class with more social pretension?—Yes, that would express it, but as a democrat I would not say they were higher.

22524. Under the old system, you mean, there was less of that?—Yes, because there was a mixture of all classes in the inspectorate. I want to make it perfectly clear that I do not wish to suggest, or allow it to be suggested that the inspectors consider, or that the teachers should regard, themselves as an inferior class, because I consider them as good and often better than those with more means and social pretensions.

22525. I only want to get at your meaning?—Yes, but it is not easy to express it sometimes.

22526. I was not comparing social classes?—They have got to consider themselves more exclusive, I think, altogether.

22527. Those distinctions of class are very often insubstantial and microscopic?—Yes.

22528. Mr. CORRY.—Don't you think it comes very often from the fact that there is so much power in the hands of the inspectors?—They have absolute power.

22529. Mr. HENLY.—Are they as well fitted for their duties now as before 1900?—They know nothing at all about their duties now, the half of them; they wrap themselves up in this exclusiveness so that the teacher may not see their deficiencies. There are some honourable exceptions, who carried down the old traditions and whose innate gentlemanly instincts no system could corrupt. The one unerring test by which the pupils always recognise an inspector is that he does not shake hands with the teacher. That test never fails. Every visitor, high or low, from the King's deputy to the parent of the newest scholar, walks in with outstretched hand and kindly word of greeting to the teacher, with the one exception of the National Board's inspector. In the evidence which our Committee have collected there are some glaring instances of inspectorial discourtesy to teachers and utter lack of consideration or respect for their "prestige" in the eyes of their pupils, but that is because an ill-disposed or thoughtless man—and there are such in every walk of life—feels that he can "let himself go" with impunity, that he is sure of being "backed" at headquarters. We have instances of where the manager of the school made complaint of specific acts of discourtesy, giving particulars, and the official reply was "that they had communicated with the inspector concerned, and he had informed them that there was no foundation for the charge."

22530. Mr. HARRISON.—Is it a fact that since 1900 fewer teachers have been appointed inspectors than was the case before—fewer primary teachers?—Yes, and the system of appointing the inspectors was changed. It was competitive—there was a limited competition—but now it is a method of selection.

22531. Yes; but I want to know whether it is a fact that in the appointments since 1900 there has been a smaller proportion of National teachers than in the preceding ten years?—Yes, I think so.

22532. Have you any facts to show that?—It is generally accepted.

Because the Resident Commissioner told us that other things being equal he always gave the preference to those who were National school teachers?—

22533. The CHAIRMAN.—There are 22 out of 70, now?—I really don't know the proportion.

Mr. HARRISON.—I want to know, because Miss Mahon's evidence suggests there was a distinct departure. I will have to find out what proportion of the inspectors were recruited from the teachers since 1900.

Mr. HENLY.—My opinion is that there were more head teachers accepted than there was before because of inspector assistants, who were exclusively chosen from the teachers.

Mr. HARRISON.—And they rose to be inspectors.

Mr. HENLY.—Yes, in 1900 they were all made inspectors.

Mr. HARRISON.—Then the number of ex-teachers now among the inspectors is very considerable?

Mr. HENLY.—I could not answer that.

The BYRNE or BOSS.—We had evidence that the number is, roughly, 23, nearly one-third of the whole; also the impression left upon us was that the number

of ex-teachers now inspectors—I am speaking of the general impression—is greater now than it ever had been.

22534. The CHAIRMAN.—Would it not be possible to ascertain the number of ex-National teachers in the service as inspectors since 1900?—

Mr. HENLY.—Easily? But, of course, the assistant inspectors were made inspectors.

If that.—What you want to find out is how many National teachers have been appointed inspectors since 1900.

Mr. HENLY.—We have the statement of a Belfast teacher, and I think it was stated by others that in all recent appointments of teachers as inspectors they have been taken from outside the teachers' organisation.

The BYRNE or BOSS.—That would not affect the case.

22535. The CHAIRMAN.—I don't think we could go into that. Now let us get on to the question of appeals before 1900?—With regard to appeals, I need not labour the point that in practice there is no appeal, as it has been abundantly proved by the evidence given even by the National Board's witnesses. Before 1900 appeals were rarely refused. There were six head inspectors, and whenever a teacher set forth good grounds for re-examination it was granted, and the head's judgment was almost invariably favourable to the teacher. Besides the written work of the examination was preserved by the district inspector, and in case of disagreement could be obtained by the Board. This was a wholesome check on the inspector, and a guarantee of fair play to the teacher. Now when a teacher appeals it is against the impressionist mark of an inspector, and the appeal is referred to the inspector charged. He sends the indictment by dragging in all irrelevant matter that could discredit the teacher, such as speeches delivered, property owned, books compiled, to justify his previous judgment, and on this further indictment behind the teacher's back, and without giving him a chance of refutation his appeal is refused, and his manager is informed that "after the most careful consideration by the Commissioners (who really never see an appeal at all) they see no reason for change." In rare cases where the manager is exceptionally strong-willed and determined or where by demoralising and denouncing back-stairs influence with an individual Commissioner an appeal is granted as a matter of favour, and the higher official on re-inspection raises the mark, the teacher or manager never hears the result, it is kept a secret in the office and the bad mark even when proved to be undeserved stands in perpetuity. This is one of the most intolerable grievances connected with the inspection system. The bad mark given by a local inspector must remain whether just or unjust, but the prestige of the inspector might be injured in the eyes of the manager. That inclination alone of the spirit of the office to the teacher is sufficient in itself to condemn the present of the administration. An inspector sees the manager only about once a year, he is entirely independent of him, and need not trouble much how he stands in the manager's eyes. After a few years he is transported to another and far distant scene. A teacher is a fixture in the locality, his only stock-in-trade is his professional reputation, he meets the manager nearly every day, he is largely dependent on his good-will, the manager may be displeased for the fall in efficiency, yet there is no redress. If the teacher applies for a higher school, that bad mark may destroy his chances by appearing in his records. The officials indeed say that he does not suffer financially, that his increment is dated back, but what is an increment compared to the loss of a man's prestige and professional reputation? An inspector may get a brand new circular every year containing old platitudes in new phraseology about his relations with the teacher, but as long as he is allowed to go out free no matter what marking he does, and the teacher to remain in ignorance of the findings of his higher officer, his sleep need not be disturbed trying to unearth the meaning of the circular.

22536. Sir HIRAM WILKINSON.—There is something that has occurred to me all through these complaints

and appeals to the Board with regard to inspectors. It is a question whether the inspector or the teacher is in the right or which is to blame. When a man comes into Court and is dissatisfied with the judge's decision he appeals. There are some judges so well up in their work as to have but few appeals, and there are others from whom there are a great many appeals. Judges do not like to have many appeals, but if they have appeals there is no blame thrown upon the judge, and don't you think the attitude of the inspector ought to be like that of a judge, and that the attitude of the Board ought to be that of a court of appeal? There should be no implication of blame upon the inspector who arrived at certain conclusions but that simply his judgment in the view of another tribunal, better able to determine it than he, was not correct. Do you follow that distinction? and do you think that that distinction has been kept in view by the teachers and the Teachers' Organisation?—Well, if you take an appeal to a higher from a lower court you get a fair trial, and the defendant is allowed to defend himself and to have counsel and witnesses, and is allowed to make the very best defence he possibly can.

22537. Allow me to make my point clear: I don't want to prevent you following that line. Do you recognise what I suggest as to your attitude towards the inspector as the man who is to blame for the decision. Is not that the attitude taken up by the Teachers' Organisation?—It is not primarily the attitude; it is only the outcome of the system, which denies a man a fair trial upon appeal.

22538. At the moment you are accounting for the existence of that attitude. Do you admit that attitude exists?—More or less inevitably.

It appears to me if the teachers and the Teachers' Organisation took up a different attitude it might be good for them, and, of course, if the Board took up a different attitude it would be different for everybody.

22539. Mr. CORRY.—You cannot take up any other attitude until you get a fair trial?—Certainly, until we get a fair trial. In one case in judicial proceedings sentence is reversed on appeal; in another it is not; but then it is generally known that you get a fair trial and are allowed to make your defence in a fair manner; that is the attitude which the Board, if it took up the position of a fair judge, should follow if there was a fair trial.

22540. Sir HIRAM WILKINSON.—You don't suppose I am suggesting that the National Board have always taken a judicial view?—No. You stated that the attitude of the National Board is not the attitude of a superior judge, but if the Board granted a fair trial and did its best to do justice as a superior judge, would it not alter the spirit and feeling between the teacher and the inspector and the Board altogether?

22541. Your answer then is, that more or less the attitude I defined is taken up by the teachers and the Teachers' Organisation?—And by the Board on the other side.

22542. And the reason of their taking that attitude is that the attitude you describe is taken up by the Board, and it inevitably follows that the teachers on their part adopt a similar attitude?—It is the outcome of the want of a fair trial.

22543. If the Board took a judicial view?—And gave a fair trial.

22544. A fair trial would follow a judicial view taken by both sides?—You understand that better than I do. You are versed in the law.

What I would like to ask you is whether in your endeavour to come to an understanding with the Board you should not keep in mind the desirability of their taking a judicial view and of the teachers, too, taking a judicial view, because it is one of the maxims in life that if you want to attain your end with anybody you must assume that they will be willing to meet you. I do not suggest you should undertake to teach the Board everything it ought to know, but I would suggest the matter would be better if it should be put forward in a more judicial way, because there are two concerned, and I am now speaking to one side. There have been questions put to the other side, and you will not understand I am putting the whole blame upon either side.

22545. Mr. HENRY.—Do you know any instance in the judicial courts where when a suit or appeal and the appeal is decided in favour of that person the original judgment remained in full force?—I think I will leave Sir Hiram to answer that.

22546. That rule remains with the Board?—It does.

22547. The CHAIRMAN.—Will you now proceed to the next point?—Yes. Mr. Dilworth stated in his evidence that the appointment of Mr. Ward gives the teachers additional means of access to the Board. It is now in evidence that Mr. Ward can only go to the Resident Commissioner with a case sent him, and I gave you an example that came under my own personal observation on the 6th August, 1912, of the accessibility of the Resident Commissioner to Mr. Ward's requests. In the evidence of Mr. Downing the accessibility of appeal to individual Commissioners is revealed, since by orders of Dr. Stankin they were forbidden access to all official information about a case except through the Resident Commissioner. I think this matter of having to get individual Commissioners to use influence is a totally wrong system. If a teacher has a case for appeal it should come as a matter of right and not as a matter of favour to be obtained through the influence of individual Commissioners, which most of the teachers cannot get.

22548. The CHAIRMAN.—I suppose in the third part of your evidence you are going to make suggestions as to matters of appeal?—Yes. The Board's rule re appeal is both worthless and misleading. Rule 96 runs, "Should a teacher have any well-grounded complaint against the manager or inspector he may submit his case in writing directly to the Commissioners for their consideration." To describe correctly the official procedure since the minute of 1902 the rule should run, "he may submit his case in writing to the Resident Commissioner, who on consideration, if he deems fit, may bring the matter before the Board," and then the teachers would know where they were to come next.

22549. Mr. CORRY.—You say that would be the honest rendering of the rule?—The honest and correct rendering consistent with practice. Then teachers would know where they were. Prior to 1908, there was a sub-head (c) to this rule which provided that "the Commissioners would, if necessary, direct one of the chief inspectors to examine into and report upon a complaint." But this, though only nominal since 1902, was omitted altogether in 1908. From the discontinuance in 1902 of the Penalties Circular,* which gave three chances, down to the present there is no systematic procedure to safeguard a teacher in the case of threatened dismissal. In 1907 a great row arose over the dismissal of Mr. P. B. Sullivan by the Board. A deputation waited on the Chief Secretary. He explained that he could do nothing but offer suggestions, and from the nature of the indictment supplied to him by the Board he did not seem inclined to interfere. This indictment was never seen by the teachers. The Executive applied to the Board for it, and it was refused.

22550. The CHAIRMAN.—What power would Mr. Barrell have to interfere?—He says himself he has got none. We have always found Mr. Eirell inclined to see justice done to us by some means or other. He says he has no power over the Commissioners, but still as far as he can use his influence he does.

22551. That is not questioned, but he has no power conferred upon him by his position?—No, but we try to get him to move by using his influence to help us.

22552. But don't you think it is strictly true to say he has no power apart from the Charter of the National Board. When you go to them about any financial matter they tell you they cannot move an inch without the Treasury, but when you go to Mr. Barrell he says he has no power over them. It is no use for an ordinary lay person to try to understand their position. I suppose the only power the Government has over them is the power of stopping supplies, and that would affect the whole of us.

The BISHOP OF ROSS.—The cure would be worse than the disease.

Mr. HARRISON.—Parliament could alter their Charter.

Witness.—This is a quotation from the report of the Deputation:—"The members of the Deputation drew the attention of the Chief Secretary to the fact that some recent dismissals had caused widespread alarm among the teachers of Ireland, owing to the manner in which they were carried out by the Commissioners of Education. It was pointed out that a teacher received no information of the contents of the inspector's report on which his efficiency was challenged. Even when the Secretary of the Teachers' Organisation wrote to the Board recently in the case of Mr. P. B. Sullivan, asking for an explanation of the action of the Board in the matter of his dismissal, he did not receive an acknowledgment of his letter. It was further pointed out by the different speakers that neither Mr. Sullivan nor any other teacher, whose work was declared inefficient, got any opportunity of answering any definite charges against him, nor had they any means of explaining or defending their position. The Deputation asked, therefore, that in the case of a teacher against whom a report was made, he should be entitled to ask for and receive a copy of such report; and, if he so desired, he should be entitled to ask for a re-inspection by an independent party as to his efficiency. It was also pointed out to the Chief Secretary that the Board had actually made a rule as to this matter of efficiency, whereby it was necessary to have four different stages of inspection before a dismissal could take place, and that they did not follow their own rules in the matter. The Deputation claimed that these stages should be strictly followed, and that the teacher should receive clear and explicit statements as time went on as to the points on which fault was found with his work, so as to give him a reasonable opportunity of making any necessary improvements. The case of Mr. P. B. Sullivan was fully dealt with, and it was asked whether it was reasonable that a teacher of 30 years' service should be practically removed from the position he occupied without any reasonable allowance or pension in such a case, even supposing it should be found that his efficiency might have become impaired in some degree. It was, therefore, claimed that the Chief Secretary should use his power to secure an appeal for the teacher on the charge of inefficiency, and that when an inspector's report charged a teacher with any serious matter involving his removal from his position the person charged should have full opportunity of knowing the contents of the reports and the definite charges against him. It was also asked that when a teacher had given a reasonable and effective service as his persistence under no circumstances should he be removed without compensation. The Deputation also asked that, having regard to all the circumstances of Mr. Sullivan's case, it was the duty of the Commissioners to do something to relieve the position in which himself and his young family were placed by their action, and they strongly pressed the Chief Secretary to urge that view on the Board. The Chief Secretary, who received the lengthy statements of all the members of the Deputation with great attention, discussed the matters dealt with very fully, and asked several questions to elucidate the different points brought before him. He proceeded to carefully consider all that had been said to him in a sympathetic manner; and he would endeavour to see what could be done in connection with them, as soon as possible. He pointed out, however, that under existing circumstances he could only make suggestions to the Board."

22553. I know he regards that as his position at present?—If the Board would receive us and discuss questions with us as does the Chief Secretary, or His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, or Mr. Lloyd George, or Sir James Doherty, even without any formality in case of urgency, what a difference it would make in the relations between us.

22554. Mr. HENLY.—You mean the whole Board?—Or even the Resident Commissioner; but I claim it is the duty of the whole Board.

22555. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Did they actually refuse in that case?—Oh, yes, certainly.

22556. The CHAIRMAN.—There is some doubt as to whether we have the *Penaltes* circular*?—I have it here, and will hand it in with Part I.; this is the circular about falsification.

22557. Mr. KAVANAGH.—You claimed to come before the Board as a deputation?—Yes.

22558. You never got an answer to that request?—No, they did not even answer the letter.

22559. The CHAIRMAN.—The circular you handed in is dated 1899. You said 1902?—I said it fell into disuse in 1902.

22560. Mr. HARRISON.—Was it issued to the schools or to the managers?—It was issued to the schools. I cannot tell you whether the managers got it.

22561. The CHAIRMAN.—You are anxious that the Board should receive representations directly from the teachers?—I am anxious, and claim that the Board should at all times be accessible to deputations from the Teachers' Organisation to put our grievances before them and to discuss them fully and freely; and not only that, but that they should hold conferences with the teachers, and managers' representatives, before introducing any new rules and in regard to matters of programmes and other things that affect both managers and teachers and pupils, and that there should be mutual sympathy, understanding, and confidence. The Board should be always accessible.

22562. Can you tell us anything about the circular of 1899?—It was never withdrawn, it only fell into disuse.

22563. You believe it is still in force?—It is not in force, but I will come to that. Owing to the dismissal of Mr. P. B. Sullivan it was revived in an indefinite form. That circular gave three chances. The P. B. Sullivan dismissal was ventilated in Parliament with the result that in the next issue of the rules, 1906, the following additions appeared to Rule 90.

Old Rule 90 prior to 1906:—

"Teachers whose schools have declined in usefulness and efficiency, or who have conducted themselves improperly, may be admonished, reprimanded, fined, depressed, or dismissed."

New Rule 90, introduced in 1906:—

"(1.) Teachers who have declined in efficiency, or who have conducted themselves improperly, are dealt with as the Commissioners determine."

"(2.) Before serious penal action is taken against a teacher he is afforded an opportunity of forwarding to the Commissioners any statement he may desire to submit in his defence."

"(3.) In no case is a teacher dismissed for inefficiency before he has had ample opportunity of remedying the defects in his teaching which have been reported by the inspectors."

"(4.) In no case is a teacher dismissed for inefficiency on the reports of a single inspector; before recognition is finally withdrawn his work is tested by means of a thorough inspection of the school as a whole, and an examination of all the standards. This inspection is conducted by one of the senior or chief inspectors, and in the presence of one of the Commissioners if they think it desirable."

"(5.) Should it appear necessary to dismiss a teacher for inefficiency, a formal statement of the grounds on which it is proposed to take action is furnished directly to the teacher."

"Any representations or explanations which he may submit in his own behalf are carefully considered by the Commissioners before final action is taken."

There are so vague and indefinite and leave so much to office interpretation, that they are absolutely worthless. Even such as they are, they are not acted upon.

22564. Will you indicate one or two points that you say are not acted upon?—Yes. "Are dealt with as the Commissioners determine." "In no case is a teacher dismissed for inefficiency on the report of a single inspector; before recognition is finally withdrawn his work is tested by means of a thorough inspection of the school, . . . Ample opportunity of remedying the defects in his teaching reported on by the inspectors." The whole thing is rather vague. It does not specify anything in particular. "A formal statement of the grounds on which it is proposed to take action is furnished to the teacher." What is

* *Ide* Appendix LV.

the good of furnishing him with a statement if he does not get an opportunity of making his defence. Then it says, "any representations submitted in his own behalf are carefully considered by the Commissioners before final action is taken." I submit that is all vague.

22574. Mr. CORRY.—Does he get a trial?—He can send on his statement, but he goes to trial. He does not know what statement the inspector makes; that was brought out clearly in the evidence here.

22575. You say the amended rules are not acted upon, as in the Delphin's Barn case?—The Delphin's Barn teachers were dismissed without the presence of one of the chief inspectors or one of the Commissioners, as provided for in Rule 90.

22576. The CHAIRMAN.—I thought the charge was that the inspector had not examined?—That is also charged.

22577. Re-inspection of the school as a whole and examination of all the standards for the year's instruction is provided for in section 4 of rule 95. Do you know did that examination take place?—The senior inspector examined, but there was no formal examination, and no result of the examination was presented to the Board, before these teachers were dismissed. The Delphin's Barn teachers were dismissed without the re-inspection of the school by the chief or the presence of a Commissioner as allowed in clause 4 of the new rule 95. The Resident Commissioner and the Chief went to the official expense of visiting to Tipperary, where there was no immediate dismissal imposed at the time, and though they pronounced the inspector justified as a result of their flying visit, yet they went there. A penny train would have taken both Chief and Resident Commissioner or any other of the Commissioners resident in Dublin to Delphin's Barn to see that these poor ladies were not cast asidrift without some show of fair play as allowed by the rules, yet neither of them went, and the inspector who reported them down was allowed to fire them out, without even the pretence of an impartial trial by a higher official. In Dundalk Mr. Finnan was dismissed after such a farcical trial by the Board that when the case was put before the Cardinal, by the Executive, he took it in hands and got Mr. Finnan a new school. I have here a general summary of the case by the Executive and also the resolution of the Executive again demanding a sworn inquiry into grave charges involving dismissal. Shall I read it?

22578. Mr. MacSweeney brought that case before us, and it would incumber your evidence by putting it in again?—But Mr. MacSweeney may not have had this statement of the Executive.

22579. Very well, read it?—At the October meeting of the C.E.C. Messrs. Mansfield, MacGowan, and MacSweeney were appointed as a sub-committee to inquire into the dismissal of Mr. Finnan. Having fully investigated the case, they found that Mr. Finnan appealed for protection from his manager to the diocesan authorities, as early as 1908. In that year Dean Byrne wrote to him:—

22580. The Bishop or Ross.—We had the whole of that already?—Very well, I'll pass it by.

22581. The CHAIRMAN.—Your next point is about anonymous charges; charges against teachers do you mean?—Yes. It is the practice of the Board to investigate anonymous complaints; that is a procedure confined only to the National Board. At Local Government Board inquiries and judicial proceedings anonymous letters are disallowed. An anonymous charge to the National Board against a teacher is sufficient to set the whole machinery of the office in motion against him.

22582. Can that be clearly proved?—We have cases.

22583. Mr. CORRY.—Where investigations were held upon anonymous reports?—Cases where inspectors came down and went into houses asking questions. I have not made any charge yet that we cannot prove.

22584. The Bishop or Ross.—We had a case dismissed where an inspector went down, and went into houses?—That is one case.

22585. Mr. HENLY.—That was at Kenilstown?—Yes.

But I thought that that charge was not anonymous.

The CHAIRMAN.—Miss Mahon says she has cases.

Mr. HARRISON.—We ought to have a concrete case.

22587. Mr. HENLY.—Can you give a concrete case?—I could procure it for you. We have fifteen hundred complaints, and we have these amongst them. We have the books of the Executive, and the evidence of these things is jotted down, and everything I say can be proved by some of our Executive witnesses.

22588. Mr. CORRY.—Who could prove that case? Which member of the Executive could tell us that formal investigations were held upon anonymous reports?—Mr. Mansfield, I am sure.

22589. Mr. HARRISON.—Could Miss Mahon produce that to-morrow?—I will try.

22590. The CHAIRMAN.—Would you try and bring the evidence in one or two cases?—I would have to communicate with all the members of the Executive, who are scattered up and down the country, but I will ask Mr. Mansfield if he is in a position to produce one. In the report of the Central Executive to the Waterford Congress in 1906 the following passage occurs:—

"We have also urged for the full measure of Civil Rights as citizens; the withdrawal of the Board's Circular on this matter, also the withdrawal of 'Confidential Reports,' and the immediate and total abolition of the growing practice of receiving and acting upon complaints preferred against a teacher without confronting the accused with the accused. These last three ignominious methods of procedure by the officials of the Board are, we believe, without a parallel in any other branch of the public service, and we told them to be contrary to British liberty, destructive of civil rights, and foreign to the spirit and genius of the British Constitution, and while acting in all things as peaceable, law-abiding citizens, we pledge ourselves to spare no efforts to free ourselves from the ignominious and servile position thus imposed upon us without legal authority."

And in a memorial forwarded to the Commissioners in October of the same year the Executive

"Complains, and justly, of the growing practice of the Board in receiving and acting on private or anonymous reports affecting teachers. Every principle of legal procedure requires (a) that the accused be brought face to face with the accused; (b) that those who have preferred the charges be called upon openly to tender their proofs in support of them; (c) that the accused be heard in his own defence; and (d) that persons be not called upon to prove their innocence. In official investigations by the National Board every one of these elementary principles is ignored. If the constitution provides that the subject must be presumed to be innocent until he is proved guilty, it is over-ridden by the National Board's departmental regulations, which assume guilt unless the person charged is able to establish his innocence."

At the Banger Congress in 1911 the demand was renewed "that the Commissioners should refuse to consider and investigate charges against teachers based on anonymous letters."

22591. You spoke about a sworn inquiry?—Yes, in grave charges involving dismissal.

22592. I understand a sworn inquiry would involve legislation?—Would it?

Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Under the law as it exists at present no one is allowed to put an oath to another except under sanction of an Act of Parliament, and if he does so he is liable to a penalty. There is in fact an Act of Parliament forbidding the putting of oaths.

Witness.—Then how do they manage at the Local Government Board inquiries?

Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—No doubt they have legal power. The question was even raised whether a Committee of the House of Commons had power to administer the oath to witnesses, when they appeared before such a Committee, with what result I cannot exactly say, but I know that Act was passed about 75 years ago, forbidding the putting of persons on oath except under the authority of an Act of Parliament.

Witness.—The Local Government Board people have the authority of an Act of Parliament, and the Local Government Board method of holding an inquiry is our ideal of an inquiry.

Mr. HIRAM.—In the absence of such security you would have stricter precautions taken for a fair trial than at present?—But there is no trial, only a mockery of a trial at present.

22586. The BURNER or ROSS.—In case a teacher is to be dismissed for inefficiency, would you demand a sworn inquiry?—No, not in a case where the teacher is being dismissed for inefficiency, provided there is not only inspection but examination of the school by an impartial examiner.

22587. Because you were not making any distinction?—Well, we do not call re-examination of the school an investigation. The method of holding investigations into charges preferred against teachers, even where the gravest issues involving the extreme penalty of dismissal are at stake, is little short of farcical. The local senior inspector comes to the school, the plaintiff makes the charges, the defendant is not allowed to cross-examine witnesses or to produce evidence to prove animus or malice. The inspector goes away and writes an impressionist summary of the proceedings on the strength of which the Board pronounces sentence. There is no note-taker present even to take down a verbatim report of the proceedings such as they are, and if the teacher has a solicitor present he is not allowed to speak. Here is an extract from the opinion of a solicitor who was present at one of these investigations:—

The BURNER or ROSS.—We had that already in the evidence of Mr. MacBewsey.

22588. Mr. CONWAY.—Is it a fact that the teacher has no right to call witnesses?—The defendant has no right to examine witnesses.

22589. Are you quite sure he is not allowed to call witnesses?—That was my impression, witnesses to prove animus or malice.

The CHAIRMAN.—That would have to be substantiated by some case.

22590. Mr. CONWAY.—It would be extraordinary if he was not allowed to call witnesses who could prove the opposite of what was said by other witnesses!—We know he has no power to examine or cross-examine witnesses, and we know of an inspector disallowing witnesses.

22591. The BURNER or ROSS.—The question is whether he can suggest witnesses to the inspector who holds the investigation and ask the inspector to examine them?—Yes, but that examination would not be satisfactory.

22592. Of course, as I understand the inspector conducts the whole examination of the parties on both sides. He is like an arbitrator, and he examines the parties that he thinks can give information, but he does not allow any cross-examination on either side. He tries to draw out the truth as far as he can!—That is very unsatisfactory, because he can rule out any evidence that he is not pleased to take.

22593. Certainly he is to judge what evidence he receives or not, and he makes a summary and sends it to the Board?—That is, the local inspector.

22594. Not always?—Generally it is the local senior of the district, and there might be vital points that might be brought out by cross-examination that would give quite a different complexion to the case.

22595. Might there not be grounds for the prosecution also that the inspector fails to bring out?—Yes, but we are willing to abide by that, but let the different sides have fair play.

22596. Sir HIRAM WILKINSON.—It would be well you should clearly distinguish the difference between examination on oath and the mode of examination without having an oath. You could have the same form of procedure as is valid in a court of justice, with examination and cross-examination!—But we are not allowed that.

22597. I know, but in your advocacy of such a mode of procedure it would be desirable that we should not fall into the mistake which a great many people fall into of looking upon an inquiry as necessarily one on oath. You could have the full inquiry with the full procedure of court of justice less an oath, and as you cannot have an inquiry on oath at the present time,

do you think that that could possibly get over the difficulty?—It is little use if there be a complaint made against a teacher for that teacher to produce witnesses on his own behalf, if he cannot examine his own witnesses to bring out what he wants nor examine the opposite witnesses.

22598. Mr. HIRAM.—Yes, but Sir Hiram is suggesting that a possible reform might be that you would get the right to examine and cross-examine witnesses without an oath?—Yes, and that there should be a verbatim report.

22599. It is possible to go some way without going the whole way?—I understand Sir Hiram's point, that you could have every possible form of a law court except the oath.

22600. The CHAIRMAN.—You come now to the London County Council procedure with regard to charges against teachers?—Yes. In London, when a charge of any kind is preferred against a teacher, it is first investigated by the managers of the school, then by the teaching staff sub-committee of the Education Committee, next by the Education Committee itself. The teacher has the right to present his case both orally and in writing before the managers and the teaching staff sub-committee, and also to produce witnesses on his behalf and to cross-examine witnesses on the other side. In any serious case which comes before the teaching staff sub-committee the teacher may be accompanied and assisted by a "friend," who is usually a colleague or lawyer. In a case involving resignation or dismissal the teacher has the right of appealing to the Council against the decision of the Education Committee. Note the various steps taken by the London Council to ensure the teacher every chance of vindicating himself before any punishment is meted out to him, and contrast it with the procedure under the National Board, where a teacher may be dismissed on the report of the local inspector. The smothering down of appeals, and the absence of any limitation to the power of the office to cast teachers aside, together with the denial of all effective means of access to the Board has been one of the greatest contributing factors to the universal discontent which has been smouldering and gathering volume for the last twelve years till at last it culminated in the events which led to the appointment of this Committee of Inquiry.

22601. You next want to deal with the inspection of schools and the awarding of increments and promotion to teachers, and the methods adopted by the inspectors in carrying out their inspection, and you say in your notes that "while the rules of the code are public the rules of the administration are secret." What does that mean?—It means that the National Board has two sets of rules, viz., Rules of the Code and Rules of Administration; and one of the peculiarities of the National Board's administration is that while the rules of the Code as published are so vague as to be almost worthless on important points, and, like the circulars to inspectors, seem only meant for show, the Rules of Administration are secret, and it is by these secret rules that the teacher's fate is determined. For instance, Rule 108 (b) states that:—

"Awards of continued good service salary are made triennially to the teachers of schools with an average attendance of twenty pupils or more, when the work done in the school shows merit, and the general condition of the schools is satisfactory."

What constitutes this merit in the eyes of the inspector, what subjects stress is laid on in the determining of this merit, and what degree of merit makes the general condition of the school satisfactory is all a sealed book to the teacher as far as official information goes. One friendly inspector tells the teachers it is "singing and cookery," another that it is "reading and composition," but the rule of the Board tells them nothing definite. Again, Rule 104 (a) states that:—

"Promotion from a lower to a higher grade, and from the second to the first section of the highest grade, depends on (i.) training; (ii.) position in school; (iii.) ability and general attainments; (iv.) good service; (v.) seniority."

(i.) Means, of course, that you must have been through a training college, and (ii.) is superfluous, as only

principal teachers are eligible for promotion in the ordinary sense since 1900. With regard to (iii.), what exactly comes under the head of ability and general attainments or how, or in what particular way they are allowed for, or how seniority is taken into account in the matter of promotions since 1904 (b), (c), and (d) lay down rigid conditions of average, not even the inspectors could explain. Then if a teacher with the required average be denied promotion he does not know in what he has failed and to what extent, whether in (iii.) ability and general attainments, (iv.) good service, (v.) seniority, and consequently he is quite at sea as to which to pull up in. That is all a secret locked up within the secret rules of the administration. Again with regard to assistants:—

"103. (c) Assistant teachers, trained or untrained, who were appointed for the first time, on or after the 1st April, 1900, are ineligible for promotion beyond the third grade, unless in exceptional circumstances and by the special order of the Commissioners."

"Exceptional circumstances" may mean anything at all. It meant two promotions out of 5,000 in 12 years, from 1900 to 1912, and one of these a Brother of a Religious Order. It meant 50 or 60 since this Inquiry was granted.

22500. Mr. COOPER.—How many were there before? —"Special consideration" meant 2 in 12 years, but now it means 50 or 60 in a few months.

22501. Well, our inquiry did some good!—According to the Commissioners' reply through the Chief Secretary in the House of Commons to Mr. T. O'Donnell, M.P., on the 13th of January, 1913, "The Commissioners have made no change in the Regulation" (for assistant's promotion), and according to Mr. Dilworth's evidence "The Commissioners recently framed a Regulation." As a matter of fact the regulation was framed in August, 1912. What marks entitled an assistant to this promotion as "exceptional circumstances" was an official secret as late as the Dublin Congress, Easter, 1913. One man asserted that he had heard privately through a clerk in the office that it was 6 "V.G.'s." Another man said he knew a manager who was informed that it required one "excellent." Now it appears from Mr. Dilworth's evidence that it is 6 consecutive "very good" reports. But an assistant is never informed of his merit mark, never knows whether he is qualifying for promotion or not, unless he happens to know some of the clerical staff in the office who risk giving him the information. The official procedure which drives a teacher to seek by private and backstairs methods what he should know officially as a matter of right is most reprehensible. Here is what the Executive in a pamphlet just published say on this subject:—

"To secure promotion to second grade now an assistant must have given at least twelve years' service, and he must be reported as 'very good' each year of the last six years of that period. Under these conditions it is possible for an assistant to be marked 'very good' or 'excellent' for eleven years out of the twelve, yet if his mark drops to 'good' once in the last six years his promotion is lost. The standard of efficiency and the length of service are, of course, most unreasonably high, but the conditions that the 'very good' reports must be consecutive brands the scheme as a gamble in which the assistant has, so to speak, to win six times to win out, and the Treasury has only to win once to chest him out of his hard-earned reward. Further, the merit marks on which promotion is granted are not made known to the assistant. They have been refused again and again. The assistant must work blindly on till the end of his twelve years' service, when he may learn that six years before his chance of promotion was killed. Such conditions can only have one effect. They dishearten and disgust the assistants, who are in the main the young and ambitious members of the profession."

22601. You say that an assistant does not know the percentage of his merit marks?—No.

22602. But you don't know it either, although you are a principal?—Nobody knows it, only the office.

22603. Have you ever been informed?—The principal will apply for promotion on the mark of the school.

22604. But you have a private personal mark on the books of the Board which they do not tell you?—So it appears now. We knew absolutely nothing about this secret rule until the Mansfield case brought everything to light.

22605. Mr. HENRY.—Until the evidence of this Inquiry was published!—We learned more since that book was published of the conditions under which we were than we ever knew before. Vagueness, indefiniteness, shrewdness, or secrecy characterise the rules in all important particulars, as if they were specially designed by a skilled mount to disguise information, or by a Delphic Oracle to leave everything open to any interpretation that may fit any official procedure convenient to the time and circumstances of each particular case that arises. In the Inspector's General Report brought to light for the first time in this Inquiry, the same shrewdness and indefiniteness is conspicuous.

22606. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you never seen the form of that report before?—Never. How could I see it. A friendly inspector might show it if I asked.

22607. But you did not know that was the form?—No. No teacher knew it.

22608. And you did not know of this query 11?—No, not a word about it until I saw it in your blue book.

22609. Well, will you go on now and deal with this query 11?—Query 11 asks:—"As a result of your own inspections, and taking into consideration all the circumstances of the School, including (1) the locality of the Schoolhouse, (2) the character of the Premises, (3) the equipment of the School, (4) the Teaching Staff, (5) the social condition and ages of the pupils, etc., and making due allowance for any adverse circumstances with which the teachers may have had to contend, classify the School under one of the following heads—Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Middling or Bad." When the school mark goes down there is nothing to show under which of these heads the school has failed. No one can tell from this whether the "locality," "premises," or "equipment" count for or against. Is the standard for merit marks, drawn up by the senior inspectors at their 1904 conference, house and peerless "of a good class and in good repair," and equipment "ample" or "sufficient," were two of the seven factors enumerated for assessment of the merit mark. The officials, in their evidence, have stated that the inspector was supposed to take a bad building into account in favour of the teacher. In the 1905 Report the Commissioners state—"The inspectors have been strictly enjoined to pay particular attention to the sanitary and hygienic conditions of the schools and out-offices, and they have been informed that promotions should not be recommended in the case of teachers whose schools were not above reproach in sanitation." This prohibition does not appear in any of the "Circulars to Inspectors" supplied to this Committee by the Education Office.

22610. Mr. HENRY.—It doesn't?—Then I should like to see it. The whole of the circulars are supposed to have been supplied, and while in the circulars equipment and promotion are mentioned twice, I could not find it mentioned that promotion should not be recommended in this case.

22611. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you any case definitely where equipment of the school did operate against the teacher?—We have cases, but you could not prove them.

22612. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Referring to the report of the Commissioners, published by them in a blue book of 1905, in which they referred to instructions given to inspectors, what you suggest is, that these instructions must have been given privately before that time, without any communication to the public that such were the instructions?—Yes.

22613. Is that your point?—Yes, and I hold that they must have been given orally, or in some private manner, since they did not appear in any of those circulars.

22614. Now, with regard to the seeking of the

teachers, that such secret instructions are given, what have you to say as to the publication of the annual report of the Board? Does that annual report of the Board reach the teachers or not?—It is on sale. It does not reach the teachers as a rule. Except the members of the Executive, nobody bothers about it.

22615. I wanted to find out how far the reports of the Board were generally known amongst the teachers?—They are not generally known except to the members of the Executive.

MR. HENRY.—At page 143 of Appendix to First Report you find the conditions of the merit marks.

22616. The CHAIRMAN.—What is the number of the circular?

No. 12. It says:—"Subject to the foregoing, you are at liberty to recommend deserving principal teachers in your circuit, whose efficiency, judged by the work done in their school, by the general conditions of the schools and out-offices as regards sanitary and hygienic arrangements, by the cleanliness and brightness of the schoolrooms, by their own neatness and that of the pupils, by the general discipline, etc., maintained during the first period of three years, would seem to warrant their promotion from a lower to a higher grade." Subject to these conditions, they are at liberty to recommend for promotion individual teachers?—It does not say they are not to recommend promotion.

22617. They are at liberty to recommend any deserving teachers?—The report says they are prohibited from recommending any teachers whose schools are not above reproach. The wording of that circular is not synonymous with the 1905 Report.

22618. The CHAIRMAN.—That was a secret instruction?—Yes, we thought so.

22619. Sir HIRSH WEINSTEIN.—The point came out before how far the circulars to the inspectors were communicated to the teachers. Do you know whether that circular No. 12 was communicated to the teachers?—No, not at all; any of those you see marked "official" or "confidential" were not. The only one communicated to the teachers was No. 6, I think, advising the instructions to inspectors in 1902. I think that contained notes on teaching. That was the only circular, and the "boys" circular published lately, sent to teachers or managers.

22620. The CHAIRMAN.—You saw the "toes" circular?—It was published in the *Freeman* and *Independent*.

22621. Now you come to the point about assessing merit marks?—An inspector is first told to take several factors into account, then he is told to make due allowance for adverse circumstances, and then to balance the latter against the former, and as a result of this balancing up to assign a merit mark. It would take a Solomon or a Balaam to perform such a task of judgment, yet on its performance the whole existence, pay and prospects of a teacher are made to depend. Then, in case of appeal, there is no record of which one of the heads was weak. Unless this Committee could get a return from the Education Office, there is no means of ascertaining whether any, and, if so, how many, teachers got higher marks than the proficiency warranted, owing to adverse conditions of school, and I fail to see what data even the office possesses for compiling such a return, the inspector's memory, or an epigrammatic jotting in his notebook, being the only record. I need not labour the viciousness of the system of merit marks, the case against them has been already made. The absence of uniformity among inspectors in assessing these merit marks, with the impossibility of establishing anything like uniformity under the present system, has also been abundantly proved, even out of the mouth of the National Board's witnesses.

22622. Mr. HENRY.—In summing up the conditions on which promotion from a lower to a higher grade is won, I suppose you are aware that teachers leaving a training college at present get their classification according to the percentages they make at the examination?—I understand that.

22623. Does that distinction of classification count in awarding them promotion?—Not that I am aware of.

22624. I am anxious for information?—How could anyone in the world outside of the office answer that question.

22625. My object in asking the question was simply

to let it be seen that you are not able to answer the question, because I think if anyone could answer it you could?—I never heard of it being taken into account. In fact, I could not tell you what is taken into account, and I do not believe any human being in Ireland could tell at the present moment.

22626. The CHAIRMAN.—We pass on now to the question of inspection, and the "possible" influence of surprise inspection?—Yes, with regard to the methods of inspection, the surprise inspection very often gives no idea of either the quality or quantity of the work done in the school. If held on fair days, or during spring sowing or autumn harvesting, most of the senior pupils are away. If on wet days the juniors are absent, and the inspector gets no grasp of the magnitude and difficulty of the teachers' labours. The first couple of months of the school year are spent laying the foundations, and getting the children over the mechanical difficulties of the new books and the new rules. If an inspector comes along during this time the progress to be recorded will be small, and not in proportion to the remainder of the year, though the work has been most arduous. To deny a teacher an increment on an inspection held under adverse circumstances—where an estimate can be formed of the progress made by all the pupils in a year, which is the real actual test of a teacher's work—is monstrously unjust. Under the old system a teacher knew exactly what was required, the rules and programme were definite, the more important and less important subjects were clearly defined, he got a year in which to do a year's work, he had time to do some necessary revision. The only argument I have seen advanced at this inquiry in favour of surprise inspection was that it prevented a general cleaning up for the occasion. The general cleaning up of the school, and the extra cleaning up and dressing up of the children for the great annual day of days to them, was most useful and admirable training for life. Periodic cleaning and tidying up take place in every household and in the life of every individual. They clean up the house for the "strife," and for the most, for marriages, wakes, and christenings, for the home-coming of relatives, for the advent of visitors. They give themselves an extra cleaning for Mass on Sundays, for visits to town, to friends, to festivities. When the school gets an extra cleaning up for the examination or the Bishop's visitation, or any great event of the kind, the inducement is to keep it so. It also in a way teaches the children respect for higher authority.

22627. The CHAIRMAN.—You have strong views about a school year for each school?—Yes, there should be a fixed day for the annual examination.

22628. Mr. HENRY.—That is that you should get notice?—Yes, so that we might have all the children there if possible.

22629. The CHAIRMAN.—What notice? How long?—I would say as in the old time about a month's notice, because all the annual sheets have to be prepared for the inspection. I would say three weeks or a month's notice should be given.

22630. But they allege that the object is to see the school under ordinary conditions?—Yes; but will they not have the surprise visits on other occasions.

22631. The incidental visits would be the same?—Of course they would.

22632. Mr. KAYNAGE.—You would not object to them?—Not at all. The incidental visits would show the inspector the working of the school; but let us then have an examination in which he could form an estimate of the teacher's labours, and the degree of proficiency to which he brings his pupils.

22633. The CHAIRMAN.—You propose the results system?—I propose it in that one respect.

22634. You don't mean you would restore the results examinations as before?—I made that clear before. I would not restore any of the evils of the results system.

22635. Would you restore the system on which the result examination was then conducted?—Not as it was then conducted. I would have examination and inspection combined, and the way I would have it done is that the teacher should open the examination and the inspector should supplement it.

22636. Mr. HENRY.—Give examinations?—Every child should be questioned.

9th September, 1943.]

Miss C. M. MAYOR continued.

[Continued.]

22637. Mr. HARRISON.—Would there be any regard to what the individual children did?—Not on marking.

22638. You would not mark each?—Personally, I think there is a good deal to be said in favour of that from the point of view of the children.

22639. The CHAIRMAN.—A child would not be sufficiently interested in the examination unless he knew how his performance was estimated?—Yes, and it would largely interest the parents to know how the child did at the examinations.

22640. Mr. HARRISON.—Is it part of your system that the examination should be annual, or would you be content if occasionally the annual examination was omitted?—You mean in the case of excellent schools?

22641. I don't know anything about excellent schools?—Well, I would have examinations every year for the sake of the children. From the teachers' point of view it would be immaterial.

22642. The CHAIRMAN.—You think the changes since 1900 have reduced the stimulus?—More or less reduced the interest of the parents in the progress of the children.

22643. Mr. HARRISON.—I presume the teachers as a body are a good deal divided upon that point?—No; it is like this: those teachers, who had experience of the two systems like myself, think that the doing away altogether with examination was a great mistake from the point of view of the children, but those teachers who have come in since 1900, who never had experience of these examinations, are, perhaps, timid about them. That is the only way they are divided. They do not know anything about it, and they are consequently not competent to express an opinion.

22644. We had many of the older teachers here, and they told us they would not desire to have individual examination of children?—You mean going into the details under several heads.

22645. With a schedule of marks against each individual child?—I would not be keen upon that, but I would like examination of the children.

22646. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—You mentioned that a year would give the teacher an opportunity for revision of the teaching of that year. Little has been said with regard to that, although one or two teachers did say that that was their system, and that if the inspector came before revision the inspector's opinion, with regard to the qualification of the children, would be different from what it would have been if the revision had taken place. I want to ask your experience of revision?—There is no revision provided for, and as far as I can see there could be no revision, unless inspection comes at the end of the year. If inspection is held, not at the end of one year, but of three or four months, you will not have revision done. The necessity for revision is this: The teachers go over the lessons with the pupils during the year. A great many have been absent from time to time. For instance, an inspector comes in. I am teaching a second class, lesson page 68; he turns back to page 36, and he examines upon that lesson. There are pupils there that have not been at school when pages 36 or 37 were being gone through, and they know nothing about them, but if I had a little revision, when coming near the end of the year those pages would have been gone over again, and it would be good for those who had been absent at various times.

22647. Do you know, as a fact, whether that course of going over the programme again is used in the schools, or is common?—I do not think it can be done for an inspection now.

22648. Mr. CORRY.—You think it could not be done if the school is examined or the report is made in the first couple of months?—No.

22649. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—My point is whether the school teachers have this revision before the school year is up?—On their own account, they have revision towards the end of the year.

22650. The CHAIRMAN.—They hold examinations upon that?—Oh, yes, at the end of the school year.

22651. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—I want to know is it common?—Yes, they lay the ground for the new work, and they have revision to make sure. I have revision in all the rules of arithmetic, coming towards the end of my school year, to make sure that my children

know them all, and are well grounded for the new arithmetic course.

22652. The CHAIRMAN.—You gave us the opinion of the London head-masters upon examination, and you have described the method of examination under the old system?—Yes. The examination day at the end of the year's work was a feature of the schools. The parents brought their children covered up in caps in the snow, to pass the examination. In this way it was a training in the pupils in concentration of effort. Whatever pupils happen to be present now when the inspector comes need not go to any trouble to answer, since nothing depends upon his inspection; and a question arises out of that. I would have promotion after each examination, and although it would be in the teacher's hands, it would be more or less dependent upon the way in which the child had done at the examination. Under the old system promotions were regulated by examinations, but at the same time the teacher always had the final word about promotion. Pupils who had passed might fail to be promoted.

22653. Would you have promotion only once in the year?—No, not only once a year. We never adhere to that rule about promotion.

22654. Mr. HARRISON.—The wording is, "Should take place"—it does not make it compulsory. Then the payment by results was essentially bad, and the fixed annual examination had faults in so far as it was carried to excess, and went too much into detail, and led to cramming more or less. Yet there is no doubt but that what was not carried to excess it was a healthy stimulus and a splendid tonic for both pupils and teachers. It gave a zest to their work. It helped to secure regular attendance, especially in the higher classes; parents took an interest in their children's work, attendance, and progress, as tested by the annual examination. The following quotation, which appeared in a letter in the Press struck me as summing up the situation with regard to examination. It is from a letter of a head-master during the recent Intermediate controversy.

22655. Mr. HENRY.—From one of the London head-masters?—Yes. The following statement, taken from the last annual report of the head-master of a very prosperous school in a suburb of London, is a clear statement on the value of examinations:—"Examinations in recent years have been more or less upon their trial. They are not the success stories; no one claims that for them; but as a means to an end they are not without a very distinct value. It is very easy to criticize where they fall short, but they have their own useful spheres, and nothing has as yet been suggested that would adequately fill their place. Life itself is constantly presenting similar problems to test one's fitness, only failure in this case is much more serious in its consequences than failure in examination. It may well be urged in their favour, too, that they get the best out of a worker of which he is capable; they furnish an excellent stimulus in their direction, and they demand a degree of accuracy which is attainable only by earnest effort on the part of teacher and taught, and this is a good thing for both. An innate enthusiasm for learning might render examinations unnecessary, but as long as human nature is what it is, that, I am afraid, points to a counsel of perfection. It must be remembered, too, that from the Government Departments downwards, through all the professions, and in the leading banking and business houses, selection, in the first instance, is determined by examinations, and as long as this is the case school training will have to conform to the law of demand and supply. While written examinations may occasionally fail to point out the man best adapted to fill a position, there is no doubt they serve to indicate the best class of men from whom a selection may be made. As in so many of life's problems it is the abuse, not the use, of the system that calls for criticism."

22656. The BRIMOR OF ROSS.—If you read the evidence you will find an immense number of your own colleagues are against you. I am sure your opinions are your own and those of the members of your executive, but you will be surprised to find how many are against you?—I think that is inevitable. If you go to the Synod in Maynooth look at the varying

opinions you will find among the clergymen there even on theological questions.

22050. I merely want to call attention to the fact that as President of the Organisation you have not the evidence of the Organisation behind you!—You cannot have complete unanimity in a body of thinkers who naturally differ according to their experience and the stages of development of their theories.

22051. The CHAIRMAN.—You want to say something about the "tone" circular?—Yes. Now it is the teachers' character that is to be studied under the regulations of the "tone" circular, in a brief visit of an hour or two, by an inspector who may be an absolute stranger, and the school mark is adjudged by him as a result of this brief study. It would take an inspector years in a place before he could study the teachers to any purpose, or form an accurate or reliable estimate of their character. The following is Dr. Traill's condemnation of the "tone" circular. Dr. Traill was the Commissioner who came to the rescue of the teachers in 1908, and publicly condemned "enforced inefficiency." He was censured by his Board at the time for his humane act and given a second chance.

22052. Mr. KAVANAGH.—I hope Dr. Traill reads that?—He was always very friendly to us. He publicly condemned the "tone" circular in 1911, and he has since resigned.

22053. Mr. HENRY.—What was his condemnation?—I am not drawing any conclusion, but it is a remarkable fact that he condemned "enforced inefficiency," and he got censured, he repeated the offence with regard to "tone," and he then resigned.

22054. Have you his condemnation of the "tone" circular?—Yes. Speaking on Friday night (June 1911), after a lecture delivered by Rev. Kingmill Moore, on the "Kildare Place Society," in the Lecture Theatre of the Royal Dublin Society, the Provost of Trinity College, in proposing a vote of thanks, said "they in the National Board were at present going through a crisis in connection with the existing system of the inspection of schools. What he might be excused for terming a fad of the National Board of Education, was to substitute for the old system of inspection a new idea of surprise inspection, with which he could not agree. The majority of the members who constituted the National Board never had any experience as managers of schools, and now what was called surprise visits were paid by the inspectors to schools, and these he held had a very serious tendency to depreciate the work of the teachers. It was very unfair that a teacher should have his school marked 'down' because an inspector based his report on a surprise visit. Under the old system every child in the school was examined by the inspector on a certain date, of which notice was given to the manager and the teacher beforehand. A fair opportunity was then given to the inspectors to base their report upon the efficiency of the teaching. What amused him most in the new system was what was referred to as the 'tone' of the school. The tone was found out by the inspector asking the teacher in one school why he had not got pictures on the wall, and in another why he had not got pot-plants growing on the window-sill. If it was left to the discretion of the teachers, one section of them would hang up pictures of saints and other representations of King William crossing the Boyne. The question of surprise inspections had come before him lately in his capacity as a member of the National Board, and the results had not been at all satisfactory. The National Board should have a system whereby they could have one thorough examination of all the children each year, of which due notice should be given, so as to give the managers and teachers an opportunity of putting their best leg forward." "Tone" was always recognised under the old system, but in a secondary place. The teachers' income was not made to depend on the inspector's interpretation of it. It is not necessary to dwell further on "tone," as its absurdity as the chief factor in school work has been simply proved before the Committee already. There is just one thing I would like to add, and it is this, that in the examination children that might be in irregular attendance should not be included. There should be some rule about

the attendance, and really very dull children should be taken into account by the inspectors in the writing of their reports. For instance, if the teacher drew attention to very dull children very much below the normal, the inspector should not take these into consideration as a factor against the teacher in drawing up his report.

22055. The CHAIRMAN.—I understand that will come up in your later remarks. Will you proceed now to what you have to say about the observation book?—Yes. The observation book is a cause of friction between teacher and inspector, and serves no useful purpose, except, possibly, to injure the teacher in the eyes of the manager or of future inspectors. The suggestions made in it are often absurd, contradictory and worthless. For instance, "More linguistic training and active thought," "Reading-homolog training," "Analysis may be taught logically," "Drill may be developed—marching," indicate nothing definite or useful. Again, one inspector writes—"Don't take up matter and explanation till all have read." Another inspector, two months later, in same school, writes—"When beginning a lesson with hard words or expressions the teacher should spend some time in explaining the words, etc." In another school Mr. C— writes—Lesson in reading not such as to produce good reading." Mr. D—, seven days later, writes—"The teacher is able to teach efficiently and intelligently," and one month later still Mr. C— comes again and writes—"It is singular how poor as a class of teaching there is in this school." And so on through the whole gamut.

22056. Have you observed any conflict between the observation book and the formal report made to the Board of the same school?—The observation book would really contain nothing in the general report at all. Then suggestions are looked at as commands. A certain teacher had a time-table which was working well. An inspector made suggestions for changing it. A second inspector, seeing the suggestions of first, repeated them. The teacher refused to alter his time-table, and the matter was reported to the Board, and the Board's reply was—"Teacher deserving of severe censure for not carrying out the inspectors' suggestions." No inspector should be allowed to suggest an alteration in either school organisation or in time-table, which involves change in organisation without giving practical illustration in the school of the manner of carrying it out.

22057. The BRUCE or BOSS.—In your observation, in the earlier part of the day, I think you complained that teachers in danger of punishment for inefficiency had not got warning, or, if so, they did not know exactly how they stood?—Yes.

22058. From some of the evidence given here it would seem that to some extent at least, the observation book served the purpose you are claiming?—After all, that is not a modification from the Board. And what inspectors write in the observation book is, in many cases, contradictory, and the teacher gets into the habit of not minding the numerous suggestions. What I complained of is that this warning about efficiency does not come officially from the Board.

22059. If it is a warning, you do not think that the observation book is the proper place for it, and you think that the teacher does not pay any attention to it there?—If you are accustomed to a person finding fault with you for many years, you get into the habit of not minding him at all. Then upon the question of suggestions as to equipment, when the new programme came out the inspectors made suggestions as to maps, charts, apparatus, &c., sometimes in the observation book and sometimes orally. There have been numerous complaints about the teachers' having to provide innumerable things out of their own pockets. The inspector comes to the school, and makes the suggestion to the teacher that these things are wanted. The teacher is made to feel by that inspector that the consequences will not be pleasant if these things are not procured. The teacher does not like to go to the manager, who he knows has no funds for the purpose, and so he buys the things himself without acquainting the manager at all. This practice is more common even among women teachers. The inspector says—"You want such a thing. You will"

get it for 8s." The teacher does not like asking the manager for it knowing he has no funds, and so he provides it himself sooner than cause any trouble.

22646. The CHAIRMAN.—Is that going on at the present time?—Not so much now. In Birr the Rev. Manager has recently formed a School Committee in connection with each school. This Committee collect a fund and distribute it for repairs and equipment. It would be a great mistake if this arrangement was universally followed, and would simplify difficulties in the provision of Cookery, Kindergarten, and other equipments.

22647. That Committee relieves the teacher of all responsibility?—Yes, in the schools under the management of Dean Seanán of Birr.

22648. Had you, since 1902, any expenditure for equipment?—Yes, but the manager did not know it. For instance, the inspector would say, "There is a map of Ireland wanted. Tell the manager." Well, I would say to myself, "It is only 4s., and so I'll go and buy the map sooner than go to the manager, who has no money for the purpose." I have been willing to footless in Kerry, Limerick, Roscommon, and nearly every part of Ireland, and many women teachers have told me that they buy these things sooner than go to the manager when the inspector presses for them. The inspector should specify in writing to the manager what is necessary for the school, or else the Board should do it.

22649. Mr. HENRY.—These Committees are confined to a small part of Ireland?—It is only in our parish, that I know of it, and in the Mayoborough district the manager also provides all requisites.

22650. In all the other cases, the teachers are faced with the difficulty?—Yes.

The Mayor or Rector.—That is all the cases she knows.

22651. The CHAIRMAN.—It was the way in Birr, before the creation of these new Committees?—Yes. We built a new school in Carrig, and formed a Committee to collect funds for the school. Then a Committee was formed in connection with the repairing of the neighbouring schools; then we have the Nun's school, and the Christian Brothers' school in Birr. The Nuns keep up their own school with their own money, and the Christian Brothers get repairs and everything else for their schools out of the Church funds.

22652. You come now to the triennial system, and you say it is essentially unsatisfactory with regard to the award of increments?—Yes. It is essentially unsatisfactory. When a report falls in the third year the teacher is punished not only for the one bad year but for the two good ones preceding, and not only that but for the three years succeeding in some cases, and the third year report of the second term may fall again. We have cases of where the third report fell on three consecutive triennial periods and the teacher was nine years without one increment, though two years out of every three were "good."

22653. That is rather a strong statement. You say she lost her increment for nine years?—Yes.

22654. Mr. CORRY.—We had a similar case about loss of increments for nine years, that of Mr. Leane?—I have also a case in Kerry in my mind. Every year should stand upon its own report, and an increment should not be stopped till the teacher gets a year's notice of fall, and after that he should get another year to pull up and recover it.

22655. You would have annual increments?—Yes.

22656. In the absence of unsatisfactory reports?—Yes. The school ought to be judged on the report as a whole. I deal with that in part three of my statement.

22657. The CHAIRMAN.—Then you deal with delay in sending reports?—Yes. One of the most striking indications of inefficiency and misadministration in the Education Office is the delay in sending out reports after inspection, and the delay in the payment of increments, even when earned.

22658. Have you actual instances of reports being delayed seven months?—I think I have.

22659. We got a case of one that was delayed seven months?—Hitherto reports are sent out any time from one to seven months after an inspection. This delay militates against the chance of re-inspection on appeal against the lowering of mark owing to the long

interval that had elapsed. When the increment falls due to a principal teacher on three consecutive "good" reports—an assistant never knows when an increment is due to him, as he never knows his mark—it is rarely paid till it has to be applied for by the manager, after an interval of some months waiting. Even then, the manager has sometimes been informed that the application will be considered with the next general report.

22660. Does that mean that for his earned increment the manager has to den the office?—Yes.

22661. Where the teacher has "good" for two years, and then dropped to "fair," Dr. Starkie and he had ordered that the teacher should have to wait for the fourth year's report, and, if he got "good" that year the increment was to be given?—He said that to a deputation, and on the strength of that a man applied for his increment. He had two "goods," and then a new inspector dropped him to "fair." He wrote to me for a report of the deputation at which Dr. Starkie made that statement, and on the strength of it he applied for his increment, and it was refused him, on the ground that the inspector that had lowered his report for the third year was not new to the circuit though new to the school. That condition was set told to us at all.

22662. Mr. HENRY.—Nor to us either?—They have new regulations for every case.

22663. Mr. CORRY.—Was there a letter to that effect?—Yes. I was in communication with the teacher, Mr. Garry of Banagher.

22664. That explanation was not given to us?—If anything happens during that year to lower the mark the increment will be withheld although it had become legally due on three years' satisfactory work, if the word legal can be applied to anything in connection with Board. If the fourth report turns out well he is paid back from the end of the three years' term, but it is most obviously unjust to deprive a man of an increment for something altogether outside the period in which it had been earned. Then again, even where increments are not made dependent on the fourth year's report the delays in payment of them are notorious and intolerable. For instance, an increment fell due to a teacher in January, 1904. After some waiting the manager wrote for it. It was paid in September, 1906, one year and nine months overdue.

22665. The CHAIRMAN.—Was any explanation given or obtained?—No; the idea I always had is that they deal with batches periodically and if you happen to come in at the end of a batch you will be paid sooner, but if you come in after one batch is dealt with you have to wait months and months until they have another batch ready. I can find no other explanation of it. You hear of a great many coming together after long intervals. Of course, that is only supposition on my part, because I know nothing about the working of the office.

22666. Your next point is partial increments. We have had a large amount of evidence about that—where, for instance, a man instead of getting £7 only gets £4½.—The practice of putting teachers off with partial increments where full increments had been earned, notwithstanding all the fair promises made in Belfast in 1902, is a most ingenious device for retarding promotion, already unassurably slow.

22667. Have you known any cases of that kind recently?—There are cases. I know of a teacher put off with an increment of £1 after three years of satisfactory service. I have other cases also. Miss Donoghue of Ravensdown, for instance, earned her full increment, and she was put off with £1.

22668. Mr. HENRY.—What was her salary?—She was within £1 of the maximum of her grade, and she should have got £8 increment and the £1 along with it, thus giving her promotion to the next grade.

22669. Eight pounds and £1 on?—Yes, and not be kept three years upon £1. The same happened to Mr. Mansfield.

22670. What was her mark?—She has not got less any year than "V.G."; there was no drop in the mark.

22671. The case is this: If a teacher starting at £21 gets her increment regularly, she gets £24, £28, £32, and £36. At the time the new system was intro-

duced she was put into a school with a salary of £57. Next it would be £54, then £51 and £48, that is three years upon £1 at the end before promotion? Is not that very unjust? It is within the power of the Board to give promotion and full increment and the £1 along with it. They have done it recently since this inquiry started. The £1 brought a teacher to the maximum of the grade, or of an increment within the grade, and the £1 kept her three years longer without promotion, while the proper and generous thing to do would be to give the promotion and the £1 balance along with it at once. On the 17th June, 1903, the late Mr. McHugh, M.P., got a Parliamentary return showing that in that year 72 teachers received partial increments of £1, 90 teachers partial increments of £2, and 88 teachers partial increments of £3. In a case that happened recently a teacher was put off with £1 increment after three years. After a great deal of pressure she succeeded in getting her full increment and promotion in addition to the £1. But that happened during the sitting of this inquiry.

22692. Was that through individual members of the Board?—She was a Protestant teacher and had some very prominent clerical influence in her Church. I would not say it was brought to bear upon individual Commissioners so much as upon Dr. Starke direct. I do not say at all that there was unjust influence at work, but it is not the right course.

22693. You say in your piece that increments are a sop to influential pressure?—Yes, the fact of having to try and obtain as a sop to private influence, increments and promotion formally and officially denied is degrading and demoralising. It is open only to the few, and this accentuates the grievance of the majority, who have not this influence at their command. Increments and promotion should come automatically when earned as a matter of right not of favour. Many other devices are resorted to to delay or delay increments earned on reports. For instance, a man was fined £5 in 1906 for punishing a boy. When increment was seven months overdue he applied for it, and he was informed that owing to the action the Board was compelled to take in 1906 increment would not be paid from date due, 16th August, 1906, but would date from 1st January, 1910. Thus he was fined again "of £7-£2 12s. 6d., and all his future increments delayed accordingly.

MR. CHURCH.—Was he not doubly punished?—MR. HARRISON.—Twice over for the same offence. THE CHAIRMAN.—What is the meaning of that? MR. HARRISON.—I cannot tell, but as the statement is given it is a clear case of being punished twice over for the same offence.

MR. HENRY.—It is one of those cases that no human being can fathom.

22694. THE CHAIRMAN.—We come now to your next point, "bonus doing duty for increment." What do you mean by that?—An assistant after receipt of his first increment and bonus was appointed principal. When his next increment became due he received only a partial increment of £5, and was informed on inquiry that the bonus counted for second increment and part of third, hence the £5 brought him to maximum of third grade. Another assistant taught for five years and then became principal. Her bonus was refused because she did not teach as assistant for some period, even one day, after the five years.

22695. MR. HENRY.—Under an Act of Parliament passed in 1892 the bonus was declared to be due to an assistant of five years' standing!—Yes; the reply she got was that she should have had done work over the five years to qualify for her bonus. The bonus was denied and a considerable amount of correspondence was carried on. After the most emphatic official refusal she succeeded by influence in another direction in getting it paid. Her father was a man of considerable influence, and he went to one of the Commissioners, and this Commissioner went to Dr. Starke and she got her request, notwithstanding that official letters had come from the office explaining clearly why she could not get the bonus. She succeeded only by private influence, which is a condition of things I condemn.

22696. Male assistants of five years' standing, who are classed higher than third class, and female assistants classed higher than third class, also get this bonus?—I know the case perfectly well. She was quite right, of course, to go to her father, and he went and saw this Commissioner who got at Dr. Starke, and she got her money.

22697. MR. HARRISON.—It appears to me from your reading of the case that it could not be legally done. The official reply was absolutely correct at first; if it was done afterwards it could only be done by breaking the law?—Was she not an assistant for five years?

22698. Not if she failed one day?—But she did not fail one day.

SIR HERMAN WILKINSON.—The officials appear to have been wrong in refusing the last day.

MR. HENRY.—Miss Mahon's point is this, that they should give five years complete, and an additional day.

MR. HARRISON.—Five years complete. The question was, I suppose, whether it was complete.

22699. THE CHAIRMAN.—Now, the next point you want to deal with is fees for extras?—I should like to say that that bonus is subtracted out of increment. Assistants should get that bonus independent of the three periodical increments even when appointed principals.

22700. SIR HERMAN WILKINSON.—Has it been subtracted?—Yes, they have been denied their full increment on the ground that they get their bonus.

THE BISHOP OF ROSK.—If they continue to be assistants, they get the bonus, but, ceasing to be assistants, they don't.

MR. HENRY.—They get the bonus to whatever grade they go. Her evidence is that the bonus was allowed, but counts in this case as against the increment.

22701. THE BISHOP OF ROSK.—I do not know the rule, but I understand that the bonus would go, and does go to an assistant teacher who cannot get promotion as a privilege, because the assistant teacher is not eligible to go to the first class and second?—Under the Act of 1892, they got the bonus when they could go up to the first and second class. The bonus would not be granted unless the teacher got promotion out of the third class, and the footnote is this, "Male assistants of five years' standing, who are classed higher than third class."

THE BISHOP OF ROSK.—Do the assistant teachers in the third class still get the bonus?—

MR. HENRY.—Yes, of course.

22702. THE BISHOP OF ROSK.—But are they not supposed to be in third class? So the rule Mr. Henry has read out does not apply?—He read the rule at the time the Act was passed, giving 3½ assistants the bonus.

THE BISHOP OF ROSK.—That Act did not give any third class assistant teachers the bonus.

22703. THE CHAIRMAN.—Is your point this, that increments due were withheld on the ground that the bonus had been obtained?—Yes.

22704. Here is Rule 100 (b):—"BONUS, in addition to increments, are awarded to assistant teachers who are entitled to them under the Irish Education Act. The bonus is £5 for men, and £3 10s. 6d. for women."—That is our point. We hold that an assistant should be paid up to the maximum of the third grade. When the assistant becomes a principal, that principal should go to the maximum of the third grade, independent of bonus, and that that bonus is something altogether outside the salary and increments of the grade. That is what we held, and there is nothing in the rules to justify the stoppage of bonus out of increment.

22705. MR. HENRY.—And this bonus remains with the teacher all along. We had a curious instance in Kildare Street School of assistant teachers eligible for promotion to the first class, from the fact that they got the bonus, they were really paid higher salaries than the principals?—That is a privilege we would like them to retain.

They have retained it, and they are drawing that money still in the form of consolidated salary.

THE CHAIRMAN.—What would be the difference between the principal and a privileged assistant?

MR. HENRY.—Very little.

26th September, 1913.]

Miss C. M. Mason examined.

[Continued.]

The CHAIRMAN.—In this case, the principal has got less than the assistant?

Mr. HENLY.—Yes.

The CHAIRMAN.—How much less?

Mr. HENLY.—Less by the amount of the bonus.

22706. The CHAIRMAN.—Will you go on now to deal with the fees for extras?—In the last week, we had a complaint from a teacher about this bonus, his full increment being stopped, and his being only awarded partial increment to bring him to the maximum of the grade on the ground that he got the bonus. That is one of the things that is continued to-day. Another money-saving device is the denial of fees for extras, if anything unusual or unexpected happens to curtail by one hour the number of hours prescribed. For instance, owing to the King's week intervening, an event which he could not foresee, a teacher had only 29 hours instruction in Mathematics, instead of 40, and his fees were stopped. A lady teacher's cookery fees were refused, because she was one lesson short, owing to the fact that one of the Wednesdays (her cookery day) fell on a holiday—St. Patrick's Day. She gave the cookery lesson on another day, but that was outside the regulation time. We have had various examples of this in regard to 92 (j). I remember one very well, where a teacher's cookery fees were refused, because the substitute she got under 92 (j) did not know cookery, and although the children were well prepared in cookery she did not get her fees. Any arrangement is taken into account where it suits them. These are purely voluntary acts of parsimony on the part of the Board which there is nothing in their published rules to warrant or justify. They are not Treasury regulations since pressure by those lucky enough to possess powerful friends is able to overrule the first decision in individual cases. Then again promotion is denied to one man on the same marks that sufficed to obtain it for another man. For instance, one man got promotion to first grade with two "very goods" and a "good" in the middle year. Another man was denied promotion on two "very goods" and a "good" in the middle year.

22707. Though promotion strictly requires three "very goods"?—One man got it on two and one "good" in the middle year, and another did not. These two cases were exactly alike. Special promotion in the higher grades only deprives legitimate aspirants of the ordinary promotion due to them, as long as standard numbers exist. Under the London County Council, increments are annual. They fall due on the first of the month following the teacher's entry into the service, and are paid automatically without delay and without any special application for them. With regard to rules in general every new rule of the National Board is retrospective, unlike any other branch of the public or Government Service. In other public departments when rules change in the interests of the public service, the rights of existing servants are always respected and they either (a) get the option of continuing service only on old rates of payment, or (b) get ample compensation for any loss suffered. In 1900 the new rules swept away the classification of half the teachers of Ireland and left the undergraded and transition victims agitating for redress since.

22708. We heard a good deal about that, so I think we understand it pretty well?—From the point of view of administration, I should like to bring it in. In 1903 it was stated in Parliament, in reply to the late Mr. McHugh, M.P., that there were 3,351 teachers then in grades lower than their own qualification. In 1910, when the undergraded drew up their latest memorial for redress, there were 3,600. I am an undergraded teacher myself. These teachers always hit very sore over the fact that their first of first class was taken away, and that they were graded down to the third grade, in many cases.

22709. In consequence of the average numbers in the school?—In consequence of the fact that the classification of teachers was done away with, and the classification of schools substituted.

22710. Mr. HENLY.—They were graded upon the salaries they had there?—For the paper promotion

system the Board cannot be held responsible, except in so far as they were privy to the arrangement of the standard numbers in 1900. That was where the initial mistake was made by the Board.

22711. Mr. HARRISON.—What was the method of calculation?—I do not know that they necessarily made any calculation when settling standard numbers. They fixed on 340 in the case of men teachers as the standard number for promotion in first of first grade; there were 700 or 930 schools whose teachers would be eligible. They knew the average of the schools, and the number that would be ultimately eligible for promotion under the grading system, and they knew that they were creating grievances.

22712. I am afraid the financial difficulty at the time was very great?—I deal with that in Part I.* of my evidence. If the financial difficulty was great, that was the time to make it known to the teachers. If it had been made known at that time, or in 1902, in Belfast, by Dr. Starke, it would have been better. Instead of getting the public and the teachers generally to help in trying to get out of the financial difficulty, he covered up the tracks of the Government at the time, and now in 1911, when he sees things slipping in another direction, he comes out with it.

Mr. HENLY.—We have no evidence or reports or any printed or written documents that the Government were objecting to the expenses in extension of the system.

The CHAIRMAN.—We have evidence that they were very saving.

Mr. HENLY.—That was given in evidence by Mr. Lennex, but we had no document or any reports.

22713-4. The CHAIRMAN.—The expression, I think, was, "That the Treasury is at all times very saving, but was especially so in 1909"?—Dr. Starke tells us, in 1911, that the Treasury was very saving; but we never heard it then.

I see your point, you might have altered it by a deprecation.

Mr. HENLY.—Whether the Treasury objected to the expenditure owing to the increased classification or not, we have no documentary evidence of any kind given us to-day.

The BISHOP OF ROSK.—How could you have it; if the Treasury communicated with the National Board you might have got the communication. That is not the way things are done by the Treasury.

Mr. HENLY.—Could not Dr. Starke have done it in 1902 as well as in 1911?

The BISHOP OF ROSK.—The damage was done, and I do not think he was at all responsible for the financial arrangement made in 1900. When you read the evidence you will see who was responsible. Dr. Starke was not there at all at the time these arrangements were made.

Mr. HENLY.—I thought he made all the arrangements?

The CHAIRMAN.—I think he told us he asked for financial re-adjustment himself.

Mr. HENLY.—It was decided on before he came that there should be a change.

The BISHOP OF ROSK.—And the programme was drawn up, and when Mr. Redington died they had to suspend operations.

Mr. HENLY.—And for the carrying out of that Dr. Starke is responsible?

The BISHOP OF ROSK.—Yes, for carrying it out. It is one thing to make a change and another to carry it out.

Witness.—He is responsible for the making of it, because he even takes the credit to himself.

The BISHOP OF ROSK.—It would not follow, because he takes the credit that he would be responsible. There is such a thing as vanity in the world.

Mr. HENLY.—In the memorandum you have the germ of all these changes, and unquestionably, though it has not been written by Dr. Starke, it was written by many hands, and he wrote part of it, and he makes himself responsible, and there you will find he suggested 250 as the standard number for first division of men.

The BISHOP OF ROSK.—Why say he suggested it?

Mr. HENLY.—Because it is in the document.

The BISHOP OF ROSK.—What the head of Departments does is this. He wants more money, he goes

over to the Treasury, and they fight the question there *tribuna-to-tribe*. They may succeed, or fail, but there is no record of that at all.

Mr. HENLY.—200 were suggested, then it was 340, and finally it was 840.

The BRIDGE OF ROSS.—You had 1,100 in the first class.

Mr. HENLY.—That was not a first division of first class. It was the case of a man and a woman teacher.

The BRIDGE OF ROSS.—How many teachers had you in the second division of the first class?

Mr. HENLY.—1,500 men in the second division of first, and 1,179 in the first division of first.

The BRIDGE OF ROSS.—That is men and women?

22715. The CHAIRMAN.—You spoke of paper promotion, and you want now to say something about the effect of the grading system on rural schools?—Yes. The grading system works out to the disadvantage of the rural schools. "Country teachers," says Sadler, "need special encouragement in their work, and many special opportunities to keep up their studies. They need books, pictures, opportunities of travel, opportunities for extended internships. Above all, they need to feel that the nation at large appreciates the immense importance of their task, and honour them for their persistence in overcoming the difficulties which beset it." From every point of view the barrier to personal ambition and professional advancement created by the grading system was a grave educational mistake. Then the spirit and methods of Rule 127 (b) in 1906, and Rule 92 (c) in 1911, are other examples of the disregard of vested rights in the promulgation of rules by the National Board. Any commonsense body of men would have seen that any rule which threw the whole country, not only teachers, but managers and parents, into a violent tumult of agitation, could not possibly be for the good of education, and they would have seen the plain and obvious way out of the trouble by not applying such rule to the injury of any existing teacher. I deal with 127 (b) and 92 (j), and with the attempts made by Bishop Foley to preserve existing rights which were made public afterwards through Parliament, but somehow these things always follow after agitation, such as that against 127 (b), and after the injury that has been done to teachers on salary and status.

22716. Mr. KAVANAGH.—These are not the rules now?—Not exactly after years of agitation.

22717. Do you complain of the rule now with the footnote to it?—In 1912-13, after years of agitation, they have at last added a footnote to the rule that boys under seven years are ineligible for advancement in boys' schools where there is no mistress. The footnote is—"that the Commissioners waive this rule if the existing grade salary of the teacher would be reduced in consequence of its application." I don't object to that as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. Where there is a teacher in a school of 50, that teacher is eligible for promotion to the first grade. Now, if you take one-third of the pupils from him, say 10 boys, that pulls the average down to the average for second grade. Now, in order to do justice to the teacher, if 127 (b) is considered necessary, he should be allowed to proceed as far in promotion as he could have gone if the boys were not removed. That would be the only fair solution of the application of 127 (b).

22718. Mr. HENLY.—Doesn't he lose the capitulation grant?—Yes, but his loss of promotion is even more serious than the capitulation grant, as the rule stood originally he was liable to depression in grade as well as to loss of promotion and increment.

22719. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Supposing there was no hardship upon the teacher by this rule?—You want me to express an opinion upon the merits of the rule.

22720. Quite so; if it brought no hardships to the teachers, don't you think that boys under seven are better taught by a woman than by a man?—If I said that it would look as if I was prejudiced in favour of my sex. What I wanted to go into was principally the violation of vested rights, and it was upon the same line that I dealt with 92 (j).

22721. Let me put it in this way. Must we not sometimes think of the children?—Oh, we always think

of the children; we could not have gained the sympathy of people in our agitation if we did not think of the children. Some of the greatest authorities of the day think that little wee children are better with women teachers—that they are better instructed—but you have some great men that study child life, and who think otherwise.

22722. The CHAIRMAN.—You have something to say now on the question of programmes?—Yes. To deal adequately with the question of programmes would require a volume and a Commission to itself. The programme at present is over-sighted. No one knows what are the essential subjects necessary to any curriculum. So the teachers have just to find out the predilections of inspectors. If one man favours mental arithmetic, the children of his district will get ample drill in the number of sevenpence halfpennies in a pound, and such like problems. If another is gone on words or books, then the room is full of evidence of Nature study, another favours cipher addition, and every blackboard in his district is kept filled with columns of digits. Another inspector tries to force Elementary Science where Cookery is already taught, though Dr. Sturges told a deputation that Science could be dropped in a girls' school where Cookery was taken up. In England no subject is compulsory. Each teacher and manager introduces those subjects which are suitable to the locality, and which the staff is able to teach efficiently. But further time spent here in discussing programmes would not advance us at the present stage, except to get expression of ideas. When the teachers are relieved from the harassing distractions and uncertainties of a hostile and irresponsible administration they can give their minds to the study of educational problems. When the Board is reformed, and the spirit of the administration is changed, the question of programmes will adjust itself. Friendly and sympathetic conferences of teachers, managers and inspectors with the reformed Board will mutually evolve a programme suitable to the needs of the nation, elastic in its application to different localities, and satisfactory to all.

22723. Now, you come to the very important subject of civil rights, and the role about external occupation of a teacher, and teachers attending meetings, that is Rules 88 (a) and 93 (a)?—I don't deal with 88 (a) at all.

22724. You have nothing to say about their keeping publichouses or renting shops?—I don't see any harm in owning a shop.

22724a. It is suggested that a teacher might be suspected of treating his children unfairly according to whether the parents deal in his shop or not?—If a man is a married teacher, with a large family to look after, it is very hard that because he is a teacher, living on a small salary, he should be prohibited from allowing his wife and children to keep a little shop which might help to supply the necessary increase to his income. A more important section is that 88 (b), which says that they cannot be members of County or District Councils, Poor Law Guardians or Town Commissioners. All we ask under the head of civil rights is this—that they should be allowed the same rights as subjects of the King are allowed in every other part of the British Dominions, liberty to take part in the municipal and civil life of the community. We are getting toward that in small instalments. These rules respecting civil rights are so incentive to deception. Teachers are by rule prohibited from attending at a political meeting, yet I never missed a teacher, lady or gentleman, for a radius of 20 miles round, from any political meeting I have been at, and I have scarcely ever missed one in my life.

22725. How long have you been defying the rule in that way?—I do not say that I defy the rule.

22726. Well, we will not stand upon words. I will put it, how long has that rule ceased to be enforced? I suppose that is the meaning of it. Dr. Sturges told me the rule practically is not enforced?—The rule has been in the books, prohibiting teachers from going to political meetings, but the teachers go to every political meeting. They do not consider they are disobeying a rule that does not operate.

22727. They do not speak or go on platforms?—No.

22728. Do you see objection to that?—No. I was asked to go on a platform myself, and I was asked to speak at a political meeting.

22729. You think the teachers might have that right?—Yes, but not in controversial politics.

22730. Mr. KATZMAN.—What do you call politics?—Well, what I mean is this. Supposing there was a political meeting held in our town of Birr, perhaps there would be Members of Parliament present, but there are a great many questions to be advocated. There is the question of the Irish Language, and the question of Education, and several other questions that a teacher could speak upon without entering upon Home Rule or controversial matters. That is why I hold that every teacher should be free to go to political meetings, and make speeches upon subjects affecting education.

22731. The CHAIRMAN.—You probably live in a part of the country where opinion is uniform. Do you think it would be safe to allow the teachers in Kerry, in the present condition, to get up, one on one side and on the other, to deal with political matters. I think there are many cases like that in the North of Ireland?—I think the teachers who would do that would be a great fool. There are other matters to talk about as well as politics. Don't you think there are a great many things troubling us in Birr in regard to which I would not take one side or the other, which hundreds of lay men don't take any part in.

22732. If a teacher was an excitable person, would he refrain?—But why make a rule for one excitable person that is a reflection upon other members of the community?

22733. My experience is that teachers without any rule don't go on platforms at all.—They are not disposed to do that. Still they ignore this rule forbidding them to go to political meetings. Political meetings through the country, as a general rule, are not so exciting. The teacher might go to a political meeting and speak upon education, and upon the financial position of education throughout the country before the Members of Parliament and the people called together. He would have an opportunity there of putting his case before an audience that he would otherwise not have an opportunity of getting together.

Mr. HENRY.—I never was at a political meeting in my life.

Mr. HARRISON.—The civil servant does not concern himself with political meetings.

The CHAIRMAN.—But I suppose he does attend meetings, Mr. Harrison?

Mr. HARRISON.—I feel I have a right to attend, but not take an active part. As for distinguishing between topics that may arise at political meetings, I think it is absurd to attempt it.

22734. The CHAIRMAN.—I have been at one political meeting in 40 years, and I am teaching 42 years?—If there was a rule forbidding you to go perhaps you might have broken it.

Mr. HENRY.—There is one phase of the rule that does not come within the scope of that. For instance, if Mr. Asquith came to Dublin I would like to hear him speak, because he is a great man, but I could not go according to the rule; if Mr. Devlin came to Dublin I would like to go to the meeting simply and solely to hear him.

22735. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you a definite proposal to make, Miss Mahon?—Yes.

22736. You say the rules are not obeyed?—Yes. I say they foster distrust, and I say their absence would remove unnecessary and needless friction with the Board in agitating for civil rights. Their absence would make no difference, while their presence creates a great deal of ill-feeling.

22737. Have the teachers been pulled up lately for attending meetings?—No. The Board published that they dismissed a teacher for going to a political meeting some years ago. Recently they pretend they do not know.

22738. I suppose you deem that wise?—The absence of these rules would make no difference, and the establishment of freedom goes to prove that. I could not find a better way of making our case for civil rights than to quote Mr. Birrell's speech on the subject at

the Dublin Congress of 1907, and my own speech on the same subject at the Dublin Congress of 1910. Mr. Birrell said:—"There is one subject which I ought not entirely overlook—what is called civil rights. Now, gentlemen, in England the only restriction I am aware of placed upon the English teacher is that he is not allowed to be a member of the educational authority. The educational authority in England, as you know, or perhaps do not know, is the Committee of the Town or County Council to which the important work of education is entrusted; and as the teachers are, of course, subject to that educational committee, it is very wisely and properly thought that they ought not to be members of it."

22739. Mr. HARRISON.—As a matter of fact they can go on it, and from the very fact, so I am afraid that is not correct. They could be co-opted?—So that they have even more liberty than Mr. Birrell thought they had.

22740. Well, considering that at that time Mr. Birrell was head of the Department, he ought to know?—No other restriction is imposed. Mr. Birrell says, and now Mr. Harrison says that even that restriction is not imposed.

22741. Mr. HARRISON.—They can be co-opted, and in many cases they have been. I do not think they could be members of the Council?—They could.

22742. It depends on what the Council means?—A great many Councils changed the hours of their meetings to suit the convenience of the teachers.

22743. The CHAIRMAN.—Changed them to the evenings?—Or to Saturdays. I know Councils that have done it. Mr. Birrell, continuing his speech, said:—"I quite agree that a teacher, if a wise man or woman, will not make himself or herself a hostile political partisan. A teacher has better work to do than that. It is the essence of a teacher, to my mind, that he should be a temperate, well-reasoned person, who never becomes a slave of language or the creature of phrases, as most politicians, I am afraid, do. It is not his business to pour himself out into every strife, or grow excited over every cause. He is, and ought to be, a temperate, well-educated, well-reasoned man or woman. With that I entirely agree. You do not want teachers to be manufacturers of gas. You want them to be as unflinching members of Parliament as possible. But, for all that, an educated man or woman willingly submits to be silent of his or her rights. And I say I can see no reason why you should go into a town or village, find the teachers in that town or village, and say to them: 'You are by virtue of your office to take no active part whatsoever in any communication of public life or activity.' I am bound to say that seems to me absurd, unreasonable, and unfair, and it is part and parcel of that passion for control, for educating other people, preventing them doing what they want, which has played entirely too active a part. I think in Irish politics. But in this matter I must go cautiously. I can only make known my wishes, my opinions, my desires. I cannot control the uncontrollable. All I can do is that which I have already done, and am in course of doing—endeavouring to obtain, at all events, a modification in the right direction of rules which have already, I believe, been modified in the past, and which must certainly require immediate modification in the future. Now, I can only thank you most cordially for the very kind reception you have given to me, and I hope, if I remain in often a sufficient length of time, and if things go on as I trust they will go, before long to come to you, not only with sympathetic words, but with full hands." And I must say Mr. Birrell has done his best for us up to the present, and has done all that could be reasonably expected of him considering his difficulties.

22744. The CHAIRMAN.—You referred to your speech at the Congress of 1910?—Except that I would like to quote this resolution which I proposed at the Dublin Congress in 1910:—"That as the withholding from National teachers of the ordinary rights of citizenship is not merely a degradation of the teachers, and through them of the youth of Ireland, but also constitutes in various ways obstacles to educational efficiency; and as managers, teachers, and various public bodies of this country are

grassroots in calling for the redress of this grievance, we request our Parliamentary representative to urge the Chief Secretary to fulfil his oft-repeated promises to remove from the Code of the Commissioners these humiliating regulations. We further believe that as long as these degrading rules exact the misappropriation of Irish Educational Grants, as in the case of the Irish Development Grant, will continue, and several much-needed reforms in the administration of Irish Education will be denied." That shows how strongly we feel.

22745. Mr. CONNELL.—Do you claim on the part of the organisation that the teachers should have the right to take part in political meetings?—I do. We claim that.

22746. And take part in political controversy?—Political meeting is different from political controversy. As I explained, a great many things are treated at political meetings beside what I may call the controversial portion of the meeting.

22747. But if a teacher has freedom to take part in political meetings, I am afraid he would be very soon involved in the thorns of controversy?—As far as I know, the teachers are very cautious; I think, in fact, that they are over-cautious.

22748. Mr. EMMET.—I understand you say that at such meetings you would avail yourself of the audience there to ventilate educational grievances?—Yes. I tried to make that clear. You will not get such audiences otherwise, and it would be a great advantage if teachers were able to avail themselves of such audiences gathered together to ventilate educational grievances, because educational grievances are the grievances of the nation.

22749. Mr. CONNELL.—The feeling I have is that there are sufficient opportunities already of taking part in political meetings?—You will allow me to differ with you on that point?

22750. Certainly, but I think there are too many taking part in politics?—I emphatically disagree with you on that as regards the teachers' civil rights, and I do not agree with you that they would be led into the arena of political controversy. Mr. Mansfield got into most of his trouble in trying to keep the teachers from following Dr. Sturkie into the vortex of political controversy.

22751. The CHAIRMAN.—That was after Dr. Sturkie's address?—Yes, when he wanted us by speaking of those ignorant or afraid to speak. Of course, we knew that was levelled against the teachers.

22752. Was there any indication that Dr. Sturkie wanted to whip you up to support that speech?—There was the taunt levelled at us that we were either ignorant or afraid to speak upon the subject. We knew very well for months before that we were under suspicion. Since I became President, being known to be a Home Ruler in politics, I was under suspicion, and it was circulated from the Education Office that both Mr. Mansfield and myself were carrying the Central Executive Committee along a certain course, namely, to be low, and not to embarrass the Government or the Nationalist party on the finances of Education, and that that was why we were not pressing the matter. That was circulated from the Education Office, especially in the North of Ireland. Our delegates went across to London for the debate on the estimates in 1912, and it was circulated that that deputations had come to an agreement with the leader of the Irish Party to keep quiet over this question of education finance, and the teachers in the North of Ireland, and teachers who were Unionist in politics, wrote me very strongly on the matter, and pointed out how it had emanated from the Education Office, and how they got the notion about it, and I had to send my private letters which I received from the members of the deputation while in England, to one Association in the North of Ireland, which convinced them that there was no justification for the remark. We knew the significance of the speech of Dr. Sturkie in Cork, attacking the finances of the Home Rule Bill. We always fought for increased finances, while he was long silent, and now we did not want to be dragged at the heels of the National Board, who never helped us, but always hindered us.

22753. Do you think you have now completed what you want to say about Civil Rights?—I should like to quote something from my speech on Civil Rights in 1910. It is not that I want to repeat the speech, but it expresses as well as any other phraseology I could use what I have got to say on the matter. I will just quote a few extracts. I said—"For instance, they had been told that if they were not prohibited from sitting on Public Boards, or taking any part in political or municipal affairs, they would neglect their school duties, or get into trouble with their neighbours. As regards the first of those, surely there were a sufficient number of inspectors going round to see that they did not neglect their duties, and then, as most public Boards met on week-days, teachers could not attend there, as they would be engaged in their schools at those times. In the case of Boards that met on Saturdays, if any district wished to utilise the expert knowledge of the teacher on one of those Boards, and if he was willing to lend his services to benefit the community, why should he be penalised for doing so. Lady Guardians and Councillors were not unknown in Ireland, and if the public thought that the presence of a lady teacher on a public Board would be for the general good, why, in all conscience, should they not have her if she was willing to serve. . . . As a matter of fact, very few lady teachers could spare any time to give honorary service to their country, but, at the same time, they resented being labelled dangerous by these humiliating rules depriving them of the civil freedom that so few of them would use, and some of them would abuse. . . . As a general rule, teachers had no very general desire to invade the public Boards no more than clergymen, doctors, solicitors, or any other free class, but they did desire to be able to walk among their neighbours without having the brand of slavery on them, because of their profession." That represents our point of view. We feel the degradation more than the deprivation.

22754. The CHAIRMAN.—The deprivation of rights which you would seldom exercise if left free?—In the same way with regard to political freedom, the teachers had no wish to get mixed up in political intrigues, but it was well known that the political platform was the only place at which they could get the people together to address them or command their attention. Without intermeddling in political issues it ought to be permissible, and even commendable, for a teacher to attend a political meeting to plead the cause of education, to make the people sensible of the loss they sustained by the misappropriation and loss of some educational grants, the denial of others, and the Treasury device for putting them down still further, and to enlist their support in the agitation for the reforms needed and the money due to make them sensible of educational wrongs, and to arouse in them a determination to have their wrongs righted. In the latest report of the Commissioners there were eleven writs because of eleven applications to the Treasury for eleven educational needs and eleven refusals. In fact, the only application granted by the Treasury was one which we were naively told required no additional expenditure. While the Commissioners are thus ignominiously treated by the Treasury year after year, they menace those who would be their most powerful auxiliaries in obtaining this money—the National teachers. Teachers had attended the political conventions, Nationalist and Unionist, at the time of the Council Bill in 1907, solely to deal with the educational arrangements in the Bill, and they did not raise any violent hubbub there. To convince the Commissioners of the seriousness of their demands for civil rights, and their indignation at the denial of those, something more than mere words are necessary. They must act, and they must make some protest. To strike would be unfair to the public and the managers who went on their side, but they could send no deputation to Tyrone House until the Commissioners signed their charter of freedom. They could refuse to crawl up the backstairs to speak in a headman's key, to beg in tones of mendicant supplication for favours they would never get in that way. Was anything ever won by such apologetic tergiversation, or cringing servility, or specious moderation? This is a protest we can

29th September, 1913.]

Miss C. M. MAHON EXAMINED.

[Continued.]

make, and ought to make, and I believe we shall lose nothing by thus taking a manly stand. Till such time as the Commissioners meet and confer with us, as man to man, as employer to employed, and not as a serf to overlord, let our deputations be cross-Channel deputations. Let us urge the Irish M.P.'s to exhaust all the forms of the House to draw attention to this grievance, and if all possible methods fail to create a small revolution, and to introduce a Bill declaring it illegal for any Head to make bye-laws depriving any portion of His Majesty's subjects of the ordinary rights of citizenship conferred upon them by the British Constitution during good conduct and obedience to law. In fact, they looked to their Irish Members during this year, when so much power lay in their hands, to take whatever means were possible to secure freedom for the Irish teaching body. The Resident Commissioner was reputed to be one of the best Greek scholars in the world, and this was very appropriate, as the Greeks were renowned for education; but she would like to ask him did that classic race make scholars of their children by making slaves of their teachers? Were the churches of the Athenians and the Spartans outside the pale of the Constitution? Surely an administrator who could bring the wisdom of ages to bear on his actions ought to be able to convince the small number of his colleagues who were hostile. If rumour spoke truly, the majority of them were in favour of the teachers' demands. The Commissioners had already granted some instalments of freedom, and the results justified their action. In 1906 the rule prohibiting teachers from attending fairs, markets, and meetings, and from engaging in controversy, dropped out and no disastrous results followed. The teachers alone had not invaded the fairs. They had not caused any alarming fluctuations in the market prices, they had not made themselves obnoxious at any meeting, and there was no record of their having

engaged in any violent controversies with the public. In 1908 the rules were relaxed still further, in so far as to accord permission to teachers to become secretaries of School Attendance Committees, and since then they did not show any unusual eagerness to monopolise this position. If the Commissioners were cancel 89 altogether, there is not the slightest fear that the teachers will desert their schools forthwith, and rush headlong into all the public haunts of the country. If they go farther, and sweep away 88 along with 89, there is no reason to suppose that the teachers will proceed straight away to lay up publichouses, or to enter into commercial contracts with the owners of them, when not forbidden with the rule to do so. She appealed to the Commissioners not to drive them to extremes, to cast aside timidity and distrust, and to drop out 88 and 89 altogether from the rules, and thus trust teachers with their civil freedom for one year. If they abused it the rules could be as easily restored as cancelled; but she ventured to assure the Commissioners that their restoration would never be necessary. From that Congress they said to the Commissioners—'You behold us, the representatives of 8,000 teachers, arrayed together, united in this demand. Is it meet or wise to turn this Organisation into one of hostility to you? Disarray by equality, disarm us by civil freedom! Instead of discontented slaves make us contented citizens. If you do this your hands will be strengthened, your power to do good increased, the emancipated teachers will be your most faithful and most powerful allies, working in harmony with you for the cause of education. They will be your best and truest friends in time of storm and stress, when the voice of the teachers might turn the tide, as it often did before; and if not, do not blame us, for we tell you here to-day—and our words will be echoed through Ireland to-morrow—our civil rights we mean to win.' In the light of recent events, this surely was prophetic.

FIFTIETH DAY.—WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10TH, 1913.

At 23, Kedara-street, Dublin.

Present:—Sir SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LLT.D., LL.D. (Chairman); The Most Rev DENIS KELLY, D.D., Bishop of Ross; Mr. JOHN COFFEY; Mr. HENRICH E. B. HARRISON, B.A.; Mr. JEREMIAH HENRY; Mr. WALTER MCMURDOUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.; and
Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Miss CATHERINE M. MAHON, President, Irish National Teachers' Organisation, further examined.

29754a. The CHAIRMAN.—I believe you have not got your *précis** for to-day before you?—I will do my best. I have headings and notes. I will follow the heads and the suggestions under them, and perhaps you would ask me questions. I want to deal with the concluding portions of the terms of reference, namely, "whether any, and, if so, what changes are desirable in the system of inspection"; also "whether in any case some notice of the intention to make new rules should be published." The first matter I take is the Board, and I just wrote out the opinions of the teachers with regard to the Board.

29755. You mean its constitution and composition?—Yes, with regard to the formation of the Board, that is not a matter, I believe, that you can touch in your report, but still it bears on reforms in connection with inspection.

29756. Do you understand we cannot make recommendations about reconstitution of the Board?—On the original constitution I know, but I wish to record the firm and universal conviction of the teachers that no changes in inspection only, will produce peace, security, and progress, till radical changes are first made at the root of all the evils, viz., in the administration. The Board requires to be reformed and the personnel of the administration

changed, before any confidence can ever again be reposed in the working of the Education Office. In my Congress address, 1913, I sketched what I thought would be a satisfactory Board. I know this Committee of Inquiry cannot touch the charter of the Board, but yet I hope that some of the methods of procedure I suggested may be recommended in the present Board, pending the greater reform essential to Education Board sketched by me in my Congress address, 1913. "The constituent parts of this nation directly interested and experienced in Primary Education are threefold:—(1) The People; (2) The Managers; (3) The Teachers. A perfect, popular and satisfactory Board can be elected thus.—Let (1) the General Council of County Councils, as representing the people, (2) the Managers' Association (Catholic and Protestant), as representing the managers, (3) the Teachers' Organisation, as representing the teachers, elect five members each. Then, as the State collects and distributes the Educational finances, let the Cabinet, whether Home or Foreign, select five members. The members elected thus will not necessarily be Counsellors, Clergymen, Teachers, or Cabinet Ministers, but rather Educationists in whom the electors have confidence. Let such a Board be responsible to Parliament (whether English or Irish), and, above all, let it be elected for a term of, say, three or five years, preferably three,

* Vide Appendix LII.

at the end of which time there will be a reduction and all unsatisfactory members replaced. Life tenure and secret procedure are responsible for all the wrongs of the present system. Any Board elected for life inevitably becomes, firstly, indifferent; secondly, reactionary; thirdly, despotic, and despotism always leads to anarchy. With the permanent Resident Commissioner there should be a paid Assistant Commissioner, so that one could keep a check on the other, and as the present Resident Commissioner has acquired an improper significance, the names might be changed to Director and Assistant Director; the Assistant to have the same voting power as the Director at Board meetings, etc. These two should not be Civil Servants, but public servants, with full civil rights, and they should observe the same spirit of give and take in criticism of their acts as all other public servants from Cabinet Ministers downwards. This Board should be divided into several sub-committees, each in charge of a special department, one dealing with Building Grants and General Finance; another with programmes, school books, etc.; another with inspection and appeals; another with training and promotion of teachers, and so on. The sub-committees should report the results of their findings to the full Board, the latter only to take action thereon. The meetings of the Board should be rather open to the Press or fully reported in the Press by the Secretary (same as the teachers' executive meetings). No rule or change to be made except by resolution of the whole Board, the proposer and seconder, with names of those voting for and against, to be given in the published report of the proceedings. Even then such resolution should be laid before Parliament for a certain time, and should get Parliamentary sanction before it becomes a rule of the Board. In cases of grave hardship there should be always the right of appeal to Parliament, as the supreme controlling authority of such Board. Even if all the education systems are co-ordinated under one central authority, as they ought, this new National Board, which I have endeavored to sketch, should form the primary education section of the Central Board. The only difference co-ordination would make, would be to lessen the number of members from each of the elective bodies I have enumerated. Such a Board would realise popular control in the truest sense, and whether Home Rule comes or not, I challenge anyone to find a better scheme of reform that will give satisfaction to all minds and classes, that will abolish present and prevent future strife, and promote peace and progress in our new nationhood. And now I put it a plea for my sex. Half the teachers are women, half the school children are girls. A proportion of the members of the new Board should be women, and either the Director or Sub-Director should be a woman. Since the above address was delivered the following comment on the suggested scheme of reform has appeared in the *Educational Review* for April, 1913, published by Father Andrew Murphy.

22787. The CHAIRMAN.—I am afraid if I allowed you to bring in newspaper comments it would look irregular!—The thing is there; it is published in my *Congress* address. I won't read it if you think it better not.

22788. Mr. KATAMANN.—It is in the address?—It is. 22789. The CHAIRMAN.—It was not embodied in your address?—No, I understood the difficulty, and I am quite willing to omit it if you wish.

22790. Mr. HENRY.—Let it be read or give the substance of it?—Father Murphy made the suggestion that the difficulty about the Board I sketched is that all the Councils are not in the General Council of the County Councils, but that it would be easy to provide that all the Councils should appoint a joint Council if only for this purpose of electing representatives on an education conference.

22791. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—I would like to point out some other difficulties in your scheme, although, of course, it does not come under our terms of reference. You take the Organisation as an elective body, but a very large number of the teachers are outside your Organisation?—Not a very large body.

22792. Well, but there is a body of them at any rate?—Yes, about 2,000.

22793. What provision would you make for representation for them?—As our Organisation represents

tative I would make no provision for them.

22794. Would you think it fair that the teachers who do not think it right to join your organisation should be left without any vote in electing the new Board?—We have a very strong opinion about teachers who do not join the organisation and support those who are working very hard for them.

22795. You appealed yesterday, once and over again to the principle of the British Constitution. Do you think it is in accordance with the principle of the British Constitution that those teachers who had not joined your organisation should be left without a vote?—Women in general are members of the British Constitution, and they have no vote.

22796. I don't want to go into that at all. I want an answer to my question. We are outside the terms of reference already, and if we take up the suffrage question we will be much worse?—If it came to that point some provision could be made as in the case of the General Council of the County Councils.

It is not such an easy matter. I would like to see how you would make that provision.

Mr. HENRY.—There would be no trouble at all.

The BISHOP OF ROSS.—There would be more than you think.

The CHAIRMAN.—This is all very interesting, but I must rule that it is clearly outside our purview.

22797. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—This has gone upon our notes, and I wish it to go upon the notes that in my opinion it is not such an easy matter. These are numbers of teachers not in your Association, and you are up against this difficulty that you must leave them without a vote or force them into some kind of voluntary association?—If they go into an organisation of their own they can do so as if they don't like ours.

22798. But would you force them to form an organisation?—They would have a vote as portion of the people.

22799. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—Therefore, of course, the teachers ought to be satisfied as people who elect the Councils that finally elect the General Council of the County Councils; but from your point of view you are going to give the teachers in your organisation a double vote, and I might hold it would be quite unfair to give those teachers a double vote, and to allow them to vote for the County Councils on the one hand and for the new Board also.

22800. Mr. KATAMANN.—There would be the managers also?—Of course, you would have some difficulty.

The BISHOP OF ROSS.—How would you manage in regard to the managers; you have Catholic organisations of managers and Protestant organisations of managers, which include, I think, a very small proportion of the Church of Ireland managers, a number of Methodist managers, and other organisations. You would have a large number of laymen managers also. How would you give representation to them?—You would have to take a phalanx of the whole of them. It would be extra trouble, but it would meet your objection.

22801. I am only pointing out that the thing is not so easy as you imagine?—Is there any reform in any service which you can sketch out completely at once. It would take you and me six months before we could arrive at a satisfactory solution, but I believe a satisfactory solution could be found if you take time to think it out. I assure you, as representative of the organisation, the point of view of the unorganised teachers did not appeal to me until you suggested it. In any circumstances of importance that crops up in our organisation we take a phalanx of every teacher in the organisation. In the same way the votes of the teachers outside the organisation could be added in accordance with the principle of the Constitution.

22802. I am sorry you say your organisation did not think of the numerous teachers outside?—Why should we? We are working and striving and spending out money upon agitation, and they get the benefit of the reforms obtained by our organisation. We consider that they ought to join us in seeking for any reforms that may be desirable.

22803. The CHAIRMAN.—Let us not continue to debate things which are entirely outside our terms of reference?—They are outside, and this is not a question one could answer in a minute.

22772. The *Banner* or *Ross*.—You complain, and in my opinion, if I may say so, rightly complain, that there has been a great deal of changing in programmes and system, and so on. You have these changes in programme and system with a Board with a good deal of permanence about it. Now, if your Board is to be changed, say every three years, I am very much afraid you will have even more changes still?—If this Board is responsible to the people it will be answerable to the people for every change.

22773. Would you consider it desirable that the system of education should change as the wishes of the people change?—It is not a question of the wishes of the people. I think the ideas of the people are worthy of a great deal of consideration, and the people generally find out the true location of defects, and I think the opinion of the people should weigh in considering reforms.

22774. So you think you may change your Board every three years; but if the opinion of the people changed every three years it would be no real guide on education?—I don't agree that the opinion of the people would change every three years.

22775. What is the use of your Board changing every three years?—So that the Board would be amenable to the wishes of the people.

22776. Which you say would not change every three years. What period would you take, would you think a ten years' period too long?—Supposing we have a Board that is not carrying out the wishes of the people, would it not be very desirable to have an election, and to put people on who would carry out the wishes of the people. The opinion of the people not having changed, and the wishes of the Board having changed, that Board could then be put out at the next election.

22777. Mr. Corry.—Putting out of consideration representatives of the teachers on the Board, and the representatives of the managers on the Board, do you think it is important that the present Board should be superseded by a Board elected by the County Council? Do not ask me, Mr. Coffey, to touch such controversial questions. There was only one adverse comment upon my Congress address, Major Deane's. It was commented on very favourably in the newspapers, notwithstanding all Mr. Deane said about me, and there was not one personal attack on the change I suggested. I challenged anyone to find a better scheme of reform. A friend of the teachers—a man who has always identified himself with them—Professor Calverwell—made a suggestion about County Boards and it was commented at once in the Press.

22778. I am not saying your scheme is the best?—I am not tied to it.

22779. But if you put out of consideration the question as to how the Board is to be elected, do you think a Board elected from the County Council would make a better Administration Board than the present?—Yes. I can answer that very easily. Any Board, however elected, would form a better Board than the present one.

22780. The *Chairman*.—I fear this trend end. We shall create the impression outside that we are dealing with questions that we have no power to deal with. What is your next point. Have you finished with the constitution of the Board?—I have. And I come now to the Resident Commissioner. Trying to patch up and to improve the present system while the Board remains unreformed, and while the Board and the Office continue to be dominated by the present Resident Commissioner, is only putting a plaster on a cancer. The cancer is there; when cut off in one direction and patched up it cuts away in another direction, till it finally undermines the whole constitution, and ends in a final and fatal collapse. While the present Resident Commissioner remains the teachers will live constantly in a state of subdued panic, like the deer in the forest, always on the alert, with ears strained listening to the rumblings of the nearest enemy from Tyrone House, expecting victimisation and injury with every new move from that Institution, and ready to rush together to make still another fight against the next incursion. The Belfast teachers are a people whom it takes a great deal of wrong to move to revolt against an existing institution. From the time I first met

Dr. Starke in 1930 I told them where the root of all our evils lay, yet till they had their own experience of him, they could not realise the true state of affairs. Now, this week I had a memorandum from them suggesting reform, and in an accompanying letter they say—"Most of us here are opposed to the proposed divisional inspectors as a Court of Appeal; they would simply be Dr. Starke's outposts like the present system. Besides, the idea comes from Dr. Starke, and that in itself is enough." So the first thing to be done to promote peace and restore confidence would be to promote Dr. Starke to some higher sphere. The teachers do not wish or ask for his dismissal; they do not seek to return evil for evil, but they do wish him well in another sphere; for while he remains dominating education the teachers' lives will be spent in the future partly in fear and trembling, and partly in agitation and revolt. I am sorry to have to say this, and I fear it will appear hardened from a woman in your eyes, but as an educationist, interested in the progress of my country as well as on behalf of the teachers, I see no other way out of the difficulty. Then, the Office Committee should be revived and the office of Resident Commissioner should be abolished, and a Director and Sub-Director appointed. These would hold a check over each other, and men of ripe experience in the Office would hold a check upon the Directors.

22781. The *Chairman*.—What would be the constitution of the Office Committee?—The Office Committee would consist of the Chiefs and Secretaries as heretofore.

22782. There was an Office Committee down to 1902?—Yes, two Chiefs and three Secretaries.

22783. The Chiefs of Inspection and the Secretaries and the Resident Commissioner?—And the Financial Secretary. Mr. Roddington and his predecessor, Sir Patrick Kennan, always consulted the Office Committee, and from their ripe experience they held a considerable check over the Resident Commissioner.

What did Dr. Starke say?

The *Banner* or *Ross*.—He denied all that.

22784. The *Chairman*.—He said they generally attended upon the Resident Commissioner?—He said at the Civil Service Commission that he was the Office Committee.

22785. Mr. Harrison.—He said that he became that?—No; he said that he was the Office Committee; he said that the Resident Commissioner was the Office Committee, and that when he came upon the Board he reported that to the Board, and the Board took his word for it, and abolished the Office Committee.

The *Chairman*.—I venture to repeat what I said. He said he was the Office Committee, and that the Resident Commissioner always was the Office Committee, and that the two Chiefs and the Secretary were in attendance upon the Resident Commissioner.

22786. The *Banner* or *Ross*.—And that other members of the Board might come in and join him, and that those members of the Board then did form the Office Committee, but that the others were the officials of the Committee?—That is not in accordance with the principle of an Office Committee.

22787. The *Chairman*.—I wish Miss Mahon to explain what she thinks the constitution of the Office should be?—It would consist of a Director—I have done away with the name Resident Commissioner—and a Sub-Director and the Chiefs of Inspection, whether two or three, and the two Secretaries and the Financial Secretary.

22788. The *Banner* or *Ross*.—And you would make all these of equal power upon the Committee?—Yes.

22789. Mr. Kavanagh.—They would all have a vote?—Unless I gave them equal power would not the personality of the Resident Commissioner dominate the whole Committee? I am limiting the power of the Resident Commissioner, so that it will never be in the power of another man to act like the present man.

22790. The *Banner* or *Ross*.—You would have no official Secretary for that Committee?—Would not one of those Secretaries act as Secretary to that Committee?

22791. So he would be Committee-man and Secretary at the same time?—Yes. Would there be anything incompatible in that?

22798. No, not in that respect, but these would be difficulty in having an officer sitting in the Committee side by side with the Commissioners?—I never would have a Resident Commissioner with such power as at present. I would give that power to the Office Committee.

22799. Mr. HENRY.—The Director and the Sub-Committee would be paid officers, but not the actual Commissioners?—Yes.

22800. The CHAIRMAN.—I understand the great revolution in your proposal is that the Resident Commissioner shall be Chief Executive Officer, and that he is to consult the members of the Board, whose wishes he is to accept?—Exactly.

22801. And he would be called a Director, and would be merely an Executive Officer?—Yes, with an Assistant.

22802. And this Office Committee would consist of officials; no members of the Board would be on it, and it would be purely official?—Yes.

22803. So under the new regulations it would be Office government to a very large extent?—They would have to report everything to the Board.

22804. Would you have any member of the Board there?—The Board would be divided into Sub-Committees, and would look after everything by a division of labour, and report to the whole Board for decision on their recommendation as to action. That could be developed very much. The Sub-Committees should consult with the Office Committee.

22805. The BRUNER or BOSS.—On the Office Committee consult with them?—The final decision of everything should rest with the full Board, and their meeting should be reported in the Press in the manner sketched by me in my Congress address.

The CHAIRMAN.—I am not quite clear as to what you would have the Office Sub-Committee to do in relation to the Sub-Committees of the Board. I don't quite understand that.

22806. The BRUNER or BOSS.—How would you distribute the business between them?—Take the Sub-Committee of the Board on appeals for instance; the Office Committee would collect and collate all the facts, and put them before the Sub-Committee of the Board, with all the information regarding those appeals that came in.

22807. The Office Committee would decide in the first instance on the appeal?—The Office Committee would get things ready, and bring them before the attention of the Sub-Committee of the Board, who would adjudicate on them in the first instance, and who would later on put their recommendations before the whole Board.

22808. In all services you would have a few officials receiving and writing letters, but if a letter that comes up be one of appeal from a teacher, would the Office Committee be bound to put that before a Sub-Committee of the Board, or would they have the power to say, it is frivolous and unsound?—No. They cannot say it is frivolous, because it would come up through the manager generally. The teacher would have set out his cause of complaint, and there must be investigations before you can prove his complaint to be frivolous.

22809. Supposing some one in such a case indites a letter over and over again, and that his request is refused over and over again, and supposing in another month's time another letter comes up, would you hold investigation in every case?—That is an extraordinary supposition.

22810. The CHAIRMAN.—Now, with regard to the relation of the Office Committee to the Sub-Committees on an appeal, you say that in the case of an appeal it should first come before the Office Committee and then before the Sub-Committee?—Yes, it would be prepared by the Office Committee.

22811. It would be prepared by the Office Committee, but not finally decided on; they would simply arrange the evidence to be submitted to the Sub-Committee of the Board?—Yes, and after the teacher puts his case the Sub-Committee would want to interview the manager and the inspector, and arrange all the information for the Board.

22812. It is evident that there are two classes of appeals, one appeals from the reports of inspectors, and the other appeals on proposed dismissals?—I bring that out a little later.

22813. Do you mean that all appeals, even on trials, shall go to the Sub-Committees?—Yes.

22814. You would not allow the Office Committee to decide on appeals on an appeal of the teacher against the report of an inspector. That would not satisfy you?—In case the Office Committee then gave an adverse report, I hold that the teacher should have a final appeal to the Board.

22815. But still you are evidently assuming that in certain cases the Office Committee might give a decision on the appeal of the teacher which the teacher or his manager might accept. Then it would not go to the Board?—No.

22816. But if he did not accept the decision of the Sub-Committee it should go to the Board?—There should be an appeal to a higher power.

22817. But assuming that the Office Committee was well advised in reaching the case, the decision, whatever it might be, the teacher or manager in either case could take it to the Board?—Yes.

22818. The BRUNER or BOSS.—In the case of an appeal against the inspector on the examination of the school the Office Committee would be experts?—They would.

22819. Your Sub-Committee would not be experts?—No.

22820. Don't you think that the Sub-Committee would have to take the advice and the opinion of the Office Committee, and rule their judgment by the opinion of the Office Committee?—But they should see all the evidence bearing on the case.

22821. But this would be merely a question of the judgment of the inspector on the school?—Yes; but there might be other evidence; there might be evidence of unfairness on the part of the inspector and many other cases.

22822. Let us assume a case where it was merely a question of the judgment of the inspector upon purely educational matters, and with no other element in the case but that, and that this went before the Office Committee, and that they decided that the appeal of the teacher was not sustainable, then the teacher appeals again, and it goes back to the Office Committee, and then suppose it came before the Sub-Committee, who were not experts in primary education, and had no connection with the matter, what opinion could they form, being non-experts on this judgment of the inspector on educational matters? Would they not take the advice of the Office Committee, which consisted of Chief Inspectors and Secretaries and the Director and Sub-Director?—Well, you should take steps if you were on that Sub-Committee to find out everything in connection with that case, and if the teacher appeals to you against the judgment of the Office Committee you should see what second case he makes.

22823. If I am sitting on a jury, and a medical question turns up, must I not take the evidence of the medical experts?—That is not a parallel at all, because you may know nothing about medicine, but we all know something about education.

22824. The CHAIRMAN.—I will put it in this way. The Office Committee would admittedly, from expert knowledge, be a first-rate Court of Appeal as experts. You would have two Chief Inspectors and two Secretaries, and the Financial Secretary, who might not be an expert, and you would have the Director and the Sub-Director. Is there any reason to think that these men would be more likely to have an opinion against the teacher than the members of the Board. I should think there is nothing in Office life to make a man unjust?—There is this, there is a natural leaning by members of one body towards other members of the same body, and so when this Office Committee would be composed partly of inspectors there would be a natural leaning to the inspectorial side; that is the reason.

22825. Mr. HENRY.—When the appeal came to the Office Committee in the first instance would it necessitate re-inspection of the school?—Yes.

22820. And should it not be the duty of the Office Committee to see that re-inspection was carried out?—And if they did that the case might not pass there.

22821. Supporting the appeal ultimately went to the Committee of the Board, and if that Committee of the Board and there must be an appeal, you say that the teacher or teachers involved would get their rights, as provided under the rules of the Board itself. Take another instance which is in my mind. The Commissioners decided, I believe, originally against the teachers in the Dolphin's Barn case in not seeing that the teachers got the benefit of inspection plus examination. You are aware of that case?—Yes.

22822. On matters of that kind, that is to say, whether on appeal the rules of the Board were carried out, would not the Committee of the Board be competent judges?—It would be their duty to see that these rules were carried out, and were not neglected by the Office Committee.

22823. Or by the Inspectors?—Yes.

22824. And then they would have work to do apart altogether from the work of the expert judges of the details of inspection?—Yes. In seeing that justice was done, and seeing that the teacher was given a full opportunity of presenting his case and seeing that the Office Committee gave fair play.

22825. The CHAIRMAN.—There is one thing that has been in my mind on this question of appeals. Have you a Board composed of busy men, with business outside the Board. Some of them are judges, for instance. These sub-committees would have to sit very often?—Yes. They would have to meet very often.

22826. They might have to sit for days at a time?—Oh, no.

22827. Under your scheme, with the present Board or the Board you propose to constitute, how would business men of the world be able to give so much time to it?—They could do a great deal of it by correspondence in the initial stages. We form sub-committees of our Executive; these sub-committees put notices on the paper asking for particulars on certain matters, and they carry on a great deal of the initial stages of their work by correspondence; they come together on a Friday evening, and they sit all day on Saturday, and consider the matters with which they have to deal and the information received by correspondence.

22828. Would you go so far as this? Say there were four appeals, or half-a-dozen, would you have the evidence and the facts typed and sent to each member of the Board before the meeting?—Yes. I would have them got into communication with the teacher, and be sure they heard the teacher's side.

22829. Then you would have letters from the teacher and manager sent to the members of the sub-committee before the meeting?—Certainly.

22830. What is the way you would get out of the difficulty?—Yes. I say it is no excess to say that the Commissioners are busy men, and have not time for their work. The members of the teachers' Executive are busy men, and have to look after the same number of teachers that the Commissioners are responsible for, for we do not even omit from consideration cases of non-associated teachers. Non-associated teachers come to me the same as associated teachers, and I have power made any difference. Then, again, inspectors should be placed each in charge of a district, for which he would be held responsible.

22831. You would get rid of the present circuit system?—Yes. I would put one inspector in charge of a district, and make him responsible for a certain number of years.

22832. That is reverting to the system before 1903 with sixty districts and sixty inspectors?—That worked very well. There should be frequent conferences between inspectors, managers, and teachers, at which the best methods of teaching the various subjects, and all other matters pertaining to school keeping, would be discussed. Specimen time-tables for every class of school, and showing how every subject would be included, so as to be taught effectively, should be issued from the Education Office. These time-tables should be discussed at the conferences, and the teacher should be encouraged to point out their

defects and to suggest improvements, and these cases would have the benefit of the other's wisdom and experience. I put that in, because in some cases inspectors come to a school and upset the time-table, and sometimes if you upset one little subject on a time-table it upsets the whole time-table, and you cannot get it together again. For instance, Mr. MacSwenny and his wife teach at adjoining schools. An inspector came in and said "you should not have the infants on the floor at this time." Well, if Mr. MacSwenny had not taken the infants at that time it would upset his time-table and his wife's time-table, because his boys go to Mrs. MacSwenny to be taught singing. It is the same where there are any two teachers. My assistant teaches singing, and if you upset that item on my time-table you will upset her time-table as well. My assistant and I sit down evening after evening for days at the beginning of the year to compile our time-table, so as to make all the things fit in.

22833. The CHAIRMAN.—You need not tell me that. I spent my best years at such work, and I had to deal with very complicated time-tables.—All I say is that if an inspector upsets one item on a time-table he upsets the whole table. The representatives of the teachers should at all times have free and friendly access to the Board, and the conferences between the Board, the inspectors and managers should be frequently held for the enlightenment of the Commissioners and the promotion of a better understanding, the main object being, of course, the improvement of education. Each school should have its own school year, in the last month of which the examination should be held. A sheet should be prepared, showing the attendance of the pupils, and a minimum number of attendances; say, 100 at least, should be required from each child before admittance to examination.

22834. No child that did not make 100 attendances should be entered at the examination?—No; and that would help to secure regular attendance. The examination should be class examination, but in the essential subjects each child should get questions.

22835. Would you have the answers marked as under the old system?—No, I would not, because promotion after all should be largely in the hands of the teachers. The examination should be conducted by the teacher and the inspector combined. Promotion should take place as a rule after the examination, but in the matter of promotions the teacher's judgment should be supreme, and he should be always free to promote a child at any time of the year.

22836. Of course, in any school that only affects exceptional boys and girls?—Yes, the teacher to have the final word.

22837. I quite understand, but where it is done it is only done with pupils learning exceedingly fast?—Under the rule you have to promote in the beginning of the year, but sometimes after examination children could not be promoted on the result of the examination. Some children might be unfit, though they might scrape through, others might fail from nervousness, so that the final decision should lie with the teacher. The merit marks should be abolished, and the schools reported on as a whole, and a full verbatim copy of the inspector's report should be furnished to the manager and the teacher within ten days.

22838. Would that be possible? We heard that suggestion before, and it was suggested it might not be possible in the Office?—In case of appeal the Office should find it possible.

22839. I know all the arguments, but the question is whether they could deal with all the reports in that rapid way?—They could. What delays a report in a great many cases is that the inspector does not send it up to the office.

22840. He is not required to send it straight off?—He is not, and it does not matter in the least to the inspector. An inspector said to me, "I sometimes don't send my report up for a month." I said to him, "It does not matter in your case, as your judgment is fair, though you could send it in the next day."

The CHAIRMAN.—Are there any rules in the English service about sending in reports, Mr. Harrison?

22841. Mr. HARRISON.—You are expected to send them in as soon as you possibly can. Of course, I

demon to the view given by Miss Malton when she says you could send them in the next day. Very often there are journeys to be travelled, and it would be impossible to send them before a week. These would be an accumulation of work of different schools at the end of a week, and it would be impossible to manage it on a Saturday. And another thing, in difficult cases you would require a little time to think over the matter. It would be perfectly absurd to say they should be sent in the next day. An inspector comes to a school, and goes away at 3 o'clock, and surely it would not take him more than an hour to make out his report. Look what a principal and an assistant have to do after dinner and tea; surely it is much more than is required of an inspector.

The CHAIRMAN.—I think I understood inspectors finish their reports of a week at the end of that week.

Mr. HARRISON.—That would be the normal thing, but there may be an accumulation of work. In England we have to attend to correspondence and references as well as to write reports, and these are reports so important that they require time to think over them. If you insisted on an inspector always writing the report of a school immediately after being there he would very often commit himself to some hasty judgment.

The CHAIRMAN.—And the hasty judgment might be given in a choleric mood.

22841. Mr. HARRISON.—It is perfectly possible?—We say a reasonable time.

The CHAIRMAN.—Yes, and not prescribe the days.

22842. Mr. HARRISON.—It would be rather absurd to prescribe a day. It ought to be done as soon as possible. If a man was a long time in sending in his report he would be asked for his reasons?—Then I will change that, and say that a full verbatim copy of the inspector's report should be furnished to the manager and teacher within a reasonable time. Every teacher should have a right of appeal against an unsatisfactory report, and his appeal should be heard and considered by the Board, and a re-examination by a higher official granted. In the absence of a sworn inquiry, a Court of Appeal should be formed for investigating grave charges involving dismissal.

22843. The CHAIRMAN.—Would not that sub-committee of the Board deal with grave charges as well as appeals against the mark?—Yes, but in cases of local investigation I would have representatives of the manager and teacher present, that is in cases of grave charges, and I would allow the teacher every facility allowed in judicial procedure, viz., a solicitor to defend him, power to examine and cross-examine witnesses, and a shorthand writer to take notes of the proceedings verbatim.

22844. That is in the case of investigations?—Yes.

22845. Mr. HENRY.—In the case of investigations with the manager and the teacher present, should the solicitor be allowed to speak, and would you give the representative of the manager and the teacher any voice?—I would, of course. Why have them there otherwise?

22846. Mr. CORNER.—You mean the solicitor?—No, not only the solicitor.

22847. Mr. HENRY.—She means the investigation would be conducted not by the inspector alone, but by the inspector plus the representative of the manager and the representative of the teacher, and the finding would be the joint opinion of all these three?—Yes; I would not have the local senior inspector as chairman. I would have as chairman a Commissioner or chief or some very high official. Then I would have a representative of the teacher and manager sitting with him to take part in the proceedings. I would have the teacher defended by a solicitor having power to examine and cross-examine witnesses. I would have the whole proceedings taken down verbatim and transmitted to the Board.

22848. These three, the representative of the manager, the representative of the teacher, and the chief inspector, would they make any recommendation as to whether the charge was in their opinion established or not?—That would be desirable, too; in addition to transmitting the record they should make a recommendation.

22849. In other words, their finding, with the evi-

dence, would be transmitted to the Board?—The finding of these three together with the evidence is to be transmitted to the Board.

22850. And the whole thing would be laid before this Committee of the Board?—Yes; but in grave charges I would have it laid before the whole Board.

22851. Mr. KAVANAGH.—What procedure would you adopt in the case of an appeal against a report?—I would lay it before the Office Committee, and I would let the Office Committee decide, giving a right of appeal to the teacher to a higher authority if that decision was adverse.

22852. Mr. HENRY.—And re-inspection?—Yes; I take that for granted.

22853. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you any further notes to-day?—I have a few jotted down. I have one with regard to increments. I would have increments annual and automatic, and I would have them accrue after each year's satisfactory service, payable on the 1st of the month following the teacher's entry into the service. I take that from the London County Council Education Authority and their rule is "A year's satisfactory service is a period of twelve months during which the teacher has not been guilty of any grave misconduct."

22854. The CHAIRMAN.—We drew up a scheme of annual increments. I don't know whether you have seen it?—I have.

22855. I don't want to ask your opinion upon the figures, we discussed that with others. I entirely agree with your opinion when discussing the Board that it is not an easy thing to invent a perfect system, and this scheme that has been devised is open to a number of objections. I could formulate a great many against it myself, but I could formulate a great many points in its favour. Some of the objections—I won't go over them all—would be, that if a teacher were to give twelve years' service in the third grade, at the end of that period he would have received \$9 less than under the present system. Then in the higher grades, as far as I remember at the moment, the amount of money the teacher would receive would be the same. Suppose a teacher a reduction of the salaries in his school or by some other accident could not continue to receive increment or promotion there are a number of years during which if he got fixed like that, he or she would continue for the rest of their lives to make more money under the suggested scheme than under the old scheme?—They would continue to get increments?

22856. I'll take this case. Say in the 16th year, if a teacher at the end of the 15th year could not get further increment, he would have reached a higher salary by \$8 than under the old system. I could point out a number of years in which that would occur, the difference one way or another would not be much, there would be a pound or two to one person who would be lucky and would get more; another person would get less. I regard that as an objection to the system. Then at the other end some teachers would start upon a higher initial salary and would have more money to begin with, and if a teacher should leave the service at the end of a few years, that teacher would have been paid a greater sum of money under the new system than under the old, and of course that would increase the expenditure, you understand that?—Yes, I do.

22857. We had a teacher in that witness chair who came out of a training college in 1902, got into the second grade in 1909, and then his report fell from "very good" to "good," and his particular grievance was that, instead of getting into the first grade at the end of 12 years, he could not now get in until the end of 15 years, but a teacher getting special promotion would have received more money, so that this instance would have been a loss to the Exchequer, but that loss would be to some extent counterbalanced by the fact that the ordinary teacher who spent 12 years in the third grade would receive \$9 less. In everything like that there are advantages and disadvantages, and without going into details I want to suggest to you—and I don't want to pin you down if you don't wish—that keeping within the limits of the present grant, I have very little doubt that either your improved system or the sys-

tem of the Committee, will be accepted on the condition that you commit yourself beforehand by resolution that this scheme is being brought about at your own request and that you will not afterwards pick holes in it which I could pick beforehand if I liked?—We would not commit ourselves to anything like that, because we are agitating for an increase.

22858. You misunderstood me?—You mean we should not pick holes in the scheme itself.

22859. Mr. CHAIRMAN.—As far as that particular grant would carry you?—I should like it would be raised up.

22860. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—You are distributing at present a certain sum of money, £1,400,000, amongst the teachers on the basis of the old triennial increment; if the grant was increased to £1,600,000 at present it would be distributed on the basis of the old triennial increment—I see the point.

22861. So what we want you to accept is this distribution of the grant, not committing yourself to saying the grant is sufficient, upon the improved system?—I saw that, but there are two fatal objections: first, it keeps you too long upon the initial salary—seven years. No matter what the initial salary is the teachers would like to feel they were going on a little; they don't like to be stationary; secondly, higher grade salaries are deferred until too late in life. You have drawn up a scheme by which we would get increases through the whole period of service. For years and years we have been asking at Congress that we might reach the maximum salary in 15 years.

22862. Accordingly you would have to be satisfied with smaller maximum salaries?—I see that, but you could not ask me to give an opinion on your scheme now. You want me to put this before the teachers.

22863. In reply to the teachers for annual and automatic increases we have been able to devise that scheme, and we have devised the best that we could, and if the teachers want that scheme they will have to commit themselves to it beforehand, otherwise the Board will never take it up, because you can pick any number of holes in any scheme. If the Board threw this scheme at the head of the teachers, the teachers would pick all the holes they could in it and neglect the good points.—It would be only natural to point out its defects.

22864. Will you look at it from the administrative point of view. We have had a good deal of contention for the last 15 years and a good deal of that has come from the change in 1900. Would any body of administrators, or could we as a Committee suggest the throwing of a new apple of discord in between the teachers and the Board?—No.

But the new scheme would be an apple of discord unless the teachers agreed beforehand. I presume you are not in a position to accept it to-day, but I suggest to you that if the teachers want it they can have it, but unless they ask and commit themselves to it they cannot have. That is my view.

Mr. KILPATRICK.—Or if they could suggest a better one themselves.

22865. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—Yes, of course, they speak about keeping a teacher too long on £26. The way to remedy that difficulty is to start with a lower figure; the higher the figure at which you commence, the longer you defer the increment. It is impossible to have it both ways?—You could not work out a scheme of annual increments except from the beginning.

22866. You take a maximum salary for a man of £185—I merely make a shot at it—you can work it out, but if you get a maximum of £185 you could not, it is mathematically impossible—I see the difficulty, but I put before you objections that will be raised to it by the teachers.

22867. The CHAIRMAN.—Will you repeat that?—The first objection to His Lordship's scheme is that it keeps the young teacher too long without increment. Seven years without increment is calculated to damp enthusiasm. No matter what the initial salary is, the teacher should feel that he is going up, especially in the beginning, and secondly the higher salaries are deferred too long. The teachers told that they should reach the maximum in a much shorter time.

22868. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—And you admit in the same manner that the maximum should be lower than it is?—I do not.

The CHAIRMAN.—We have been told that the present scheme is very slow and then at the end it goes up very high, and that the ideal scheme would be even rapid rise to the top.

22869. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—Will you express any opinion?—I told you two objections.

22870. In order to get over the second objection and to reach the maximum at an earlier stage do you think the teachers would be satisfied to accept smaller maximum salaries?—I know they would not accept anything smaller.

22871. You quite understand you cannot have it both ways?—The resolutions passed by Congress year after year are asking for increased salaries, and the maximum at the end of 15 years, and how could I be satisfied and say that they would accept lower.

22872. Because it is a question of distributing a certain amount of money and it will not prevent you looking for an increased grant. As to the initial salary of £26, the teacher does not get increments, but he starts with £26 plus £6, and if he has to remain there for seven years, he has got two increments already?—You want them to look at it in that way.

22873. One of the reasons given for demanding higher salary in the earlier years was that the teachers wanted to marry and set up home; but young men starting at 20 or 21 after coming out of the training college don't want to marry and set up home?—That is the very thing they do want, my lord. I am very glad to hear it.

The CHAIRMAN.—That is what somebody said here the other day. The first object should be to marry as soon as possible.

22874. Mr. HENRY.—Take this case: supposing a teacher spent the whole 35 years in the service getting increments in the regular way, that teacher would receive a certain sum of money which I will call x. Supposing the distribution were made on the lines suggested with the same grant of money for some period of time at which you would reach the maximum earlier and go along with that maximum for the remainder of the time, and suppose a satisfactory scheme of distribution of the same amount of money were devised, would the teachers accept it?—They would accept it conditionally as a sort of minimum scheme built up on satisfactory lines from which they could agitate to get an increase on the same lines.

22875. I am only asking would they be prepared to accept a scheme of that kind so far as the present grant is concerned?—They would, but you have to take into account any teacher that would be injured.

22876. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—It is impossible?—Of course, that is the whole cause of contention with the Board—sweeping away the rights of those affected. That is the one thing you will have to consider. You must preserve the existing rights of those who would be adversely affected by any new scheme.

22877. In all legislation no law has ever been made that did not hit, to some extent, certain people and benefit to some extent certain others; so that the attitude of the teachers would absolutely stop all legislation?—How do they do in the Civil Service? Are Civil Servants ever hit?

22878. Mr. CHAIRMAN.—I want to ask you one question. You used an expression in reply to his Lordship that perhaps you had not considered, you said there was a "fatal" objection to the scheme as the increments did not arise sooner. Is the Committee to take you as saying that these objections are fatal? Don't you think, on the whole, the scheme would be more satisfactory than the existing arrangements?—If you put it in this way it would be more satisfactory to have annual increments than triennial, every one knows that.

22879. There are objections, but the word you used was "fatal" objections, and I rather suggest you did not intend to use that word—I see your point, and I withdraw the word "fatal," but I say there are objections.

22880. His Lordship pointed out objections, but on the whole you think the scheme outlined would give

more satisfaction than the existing arrangements?—Yes, provided the rights of existing teachers were respected. The rights of Civil Servants have been guarded in the passage of the Home Rule Bill through the House of Commons.

22881. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Your chief reason for putting forward annual increments is to make them automatic, that is to say that the increments should be given in the absence of unsatisfactory reports?—Yes.

22882. You wish to make the annual increments automatic?—Yes.

Would you see any objection to applying that system to the present triennial increments, that is to say at the end of three years the teacher should have a right to his increments if he did not get an adverse report. There would be no change in the present system; it would be merely applying the automatic system to the triennial instead of the annual. Would you see any objection to that?—

22883. Mr. HARRISON.—With one proviso, that an unsatisfactory report only affects one year's increment instead of three?—That would create difficulty in dealing with the triennial increment; it would be far more satisfactory to have each year stand upon its own footing.

22884. Mr. HENLY.—What Mr. Harrison means is this, that supposing at the end of the third of the three years the report was unfavourable then that you would get an increment of £6 instead of £9 and that the adverse report would only take away one-third of the increment?—We hold that an adverse report for one year should not take away the increment.

22885. This is not taking away the increment, it is only taking away one-third of it?—That should not take away the increment of the year, you should get a year to pull up.

22886. Mr. KAVANAGH.—A year's notice?—It complicates the matter, we have been asking for annual increments year after year.

22887. Mr. HENLY.—The phrase in the London County Council schools is that a year of satisfactory service means a period of 12 months during which the teacher has not been guilty of any grave misconduct, that is stronger than adverse report?—Does not that justify what I say?

22888. The CHAIRMAN.—Does that mean the County Council takes no account of deficiency at all?

22889. Mr. HARRISON.—I don't know about the London County Council, but what is done under most local authorities is if the teacher gets an adverse report a warning is generally issued first, the second adverse report may result in refusal of annual increment or possibly if very bad in dismissal?—That is my point. The first does not carry any penalty.

22890. I quite see, you think an adverse report should not be acted upon unless it is preceded by a warning?—Yes.

22891. The CHAIRMAN.—You see, Miss Mason, if you insist on annual increments you must accept some sort of revised scale of salary?—Yes.

22892. And there must be some inequality?—If they can be revised in such a way that the increments would begin at once and go to the top quickly, and that the teachers would go on, on a level much longer after reaching the top. His Lordship pointed out that that would necessitate a lower maximum, but that would be more satisfactory than the present 30 years' course.

22893. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—Let the teachers set to and draw up a scheme always within the amount of the Grant.

22894. Mr. HENLY.—One witness told us we need more money in middle age. Such a scheme would be more favourable to the teachers for another reason, that all teachers don't reach the maximum at the end of 30 years, and secondly if there was redistribution of the Grant so as to have a larger proportion in middle age teachers as a whole would benefit by the change?—They would.

22895. The BISHOP OF ROSS.—The proper thing then for the teachers' executive would be to take up this scheme and suggest what improvements they think necessary or desirable?—We could not get that done until we got official information.

22897. I want you to quite understand the position. If you look to a man in the second grade you see that under the old scheme a man entering the second grade gets £94 a year for three years. Under the proposed scheme he gets £91 the first year, £94 the second year, and £97 the third year, so that in three years he gets exactly the same amount of money as under the old scheme. If by any accident at the end of his first year in that grade he could never afterwards qualify for increment he remains at £91, supposing the attendance in his school went down or something happened that he could not get any further increment?—If you get into the second grade you can reach the maximum, but I see what you mean, if the average went down.

22898. He would remain for the rest of his life on £94 a year and, of course, he would say unduly—only that the new scheme came out I would have £94 instead of £91; there would be occasional points like that. If he got stuck in the second year he would get £94 in either case. If he got stuck in the third year under the old scheme he would remain at £94, whereas under the proposed new scheme he would remain at £97?—I understand, there are good points in it.

22899. It is like a question of insurance. Would the teacher take his chance of getting stuck or getting through the first year or going right on to the third year?—Of course, he would have to take his chance because he is insured, but he should be insured against loss.

22900. Well, remember except there were agreement, if a young man happened to get stuck upon £91 this question would be agitated and agitated to the destruction of the education of the country?—We would claim special consideration for him then.

22901. Would that be fair or just. If he went up to £97 there would be no question, and don't you think that as a matter of chance like the matter of insurance he should be satisfied?—Well, you see you are looking at it from the point of view of administration and I am looking at it from the point of view of the teacher, and I answer as teacher to administration and I say that before we let ourselves down we must see that no case of hardship arises without ensuring redress.

22902. That no individual suffers, or if he does he should have got special promotion?—Yes.

22903. Of course you agree that in any complicated scheme of this sort if you were to give special promotion to a number of people for all those years no administration could go on and no calculation or accounts could be kept?—I am sorry to say I emphatically disagree with you, because this is the very thing that has caused all the row for the last twelve years. When Dr. Starke came into office this new scheme was introduced which leashed aside the vested rights of individual teachers and we have ever since agitated and agitated, and there are 5,000 of those who were wronged twelve years ago who are agitating to-day.

22904. Then the conclusion is, I presume, that the teacher would not take his chance of going out on £91 on one side and £97 on the other, but if he happened to go out on £97 he would bless his good luck and if he went out on £91 he would demand special consideration?—There should be a proviso that no teacher should suffer under the new scheme.

I am afraid with that addition we shall not get the new scheme.

Mr. KAVANAGH.—You will never invent a scheme that does not bring injustice to some teacher, you cannot do it.

The BISHOP OF ROSS.—It is a question of reason, it is a question of a man fearing he may be struck off, and if that is he will be worse off than another teacher.

22904A. Mr. HARRISON.—Would it not be possible, as is sometimes done in the Civil Service, to give every teacher a chance of accepting the one scheme or the other?—That is exactly what should be done. If that were done in 1900 they would all be satisfied.

Mr. KAVANAGH.—But you would have two schemes.

The BISHOP OF ROSS.—Remember you would have to pay for more clerks and officials in the office, and you waste a lot of money on them.

Mr. HARRISON.—I simply throw out the suggestion for consideration.

Mr. HENLY.—When the pension scheme was established the teachers got the option whether they would come in under the old scheme or not; in the Civil Service they got the same option, and the two systems remain until the old system dies off.

22905. The BURNER or ROSS.—It is impossible to spend all this money upon administration, which I regard as uselessly spent. I would sooner see the money going into the pockets of the teachers rather than spent upon clerks working an impossible scheme!—It is a very serious question and requires a great deal of consideration.

22906. The CHAIRMAN.—I think we may pass on now to another subject?—I come now to the question of teachers' promotion.

22907. Mr. COFFEY.—That is from grade to grade?—Yes.

22908. The CHAIRMAN.—Would you retain the present grades?—No.

22909. What would you substitute?—I would have a system of promotion for teachers by scholarship and efficiency, something like in the old times; suppose we say two steps.

22910. By classes?—That would be three classes. After a certain number of years' satisfactory service a teacher would then get promotion partly by results on examination and partly on the results of his efficiency.

22911. You would bring back examination for promotion?—To a certain extent. I don't say in every case.

22912. You know there have been very strong objections by some people to examination?—I do. Some people hold that once you get your certificate that there should be no further examination, but there should be some fixed system of promotion. If you have your increment annual and automatic, there ought to be some system of promotion for a teacher which should bring with it monetary reward.

22913. And to avoid laying too much stress on the inspector's report for promotion. There were two elements in the old system, there was the inspector as efficiency over a certain number of years and success in examination?—Well, examination could be combined with the question of school efficiency.

22914. Not literary or methodical?—Something like the present London Examination for Diploma in Teaching. Mr. Harrison could tell us something about it.

22915. Examination on school methods?—My idea is some sort of examination in the methods of school keeping and general questions of pedagogy.

22916. One of the great recommendations that Mr. Coffey among others put before us was, it keeps a teacher a student, which he is very apt to cease to be?—That would be another advantage.

22917. Your examination would not be of the stimulating nature to increase a man's literary or scientific information?—Not so much.

22918. Mr. HARRISON.—And it would not be an examination conducted by the examiners of the National Board, but conducted independently?—Yes.

22919. Then you would be prepared also to give credits to teachers who had taken satisfactory Health Courses?—That would be for extension lectures and Health Courses.

22920. But would attendance at these count?—What attendance?

22921. The CHAIRMAN.—The objection to that was urged the other day under another head that the advantage of attending extension or University courses could not be enjoyed except by a minority?—That is what I was going to say. These courses should be universal before you could give marks for attendance at them, otherwise the majority of the teachers would be handicapped.

22922. Mr. HARRISON.—In any case those living in remote parts of the country must be handicapped?—Yes, but the more credit to them in these circumstances.

22923. But don't you think this objection a serious handicap under which many of them would suffer?—

Some of the most prominent men in this country in positions of honour and emolument were children reared away at the back of the mountains miles away from the high road.

22924. We know there are people who will always rise superior to circumstances, but you acknowledge at any rate that the system you propose would handicap a good many people?—I don't acknowledge it.

22925. They may win the race with a bad handicap, and many do so?—When promotion was open to teachers by examination it was our country teachers in remote districts in Donegal and Kerry and in the wildest districts where they were remote from so-called civilisation altogether that took the highest places.

22926. In fact those who had not the best opportunity for study and coaching?—Yes. When you get all the teachers together at any gathering you will find the teachers from the remotest districts in this country have a degree of culture and refinement and information that would surprise you and that would compare very favourably with those in city districts.

22927. Dr. Starke said that in the rural schools there are some of the best teachers in Ireland?—I have remarked it and know it very well.

Mr. HENLY.—When I came to Dublin there were only one or two teachers in the whole of Dublin having first class.

22928. The CHAIRMAN.—You advocate the removal to other circuits of the Belfast and Tipperary inspectors?—That is so; we recommend their removal for the good of the inspectors themselves and for the good of the teachers; their presence causes friction in these particular districts, and their removal would give the inspectors a chance of profiting by the lesson they have learned.

22929. That involves selection amongst the inspectors, does it?—Removals are provided for by the rules of the Board at certain intervals.

22930. That is to say you are to remove certain inspectors?—Yes.

22931. The BURNER or ROSS.—There are six inspectors in Belfast and three in Tipperary, and will all these nine inspectors have to be removed or only a certain number of them?—That would involve consideration for the feelings of the objectionable ones. If you want to save the feelings of the objectionable ones you would have to remove them all.

22932. The CHAIRMAN.—It would involve selecting one or two?—Even if I thought only some were guilty and responsible for all this trouble I would still make a general removal.

22933. The BURNER or ROSS.—Look at it from this point of view. There may be some very deserving persons amongst the inspectors from the teachers' point of view, amongst these nine inspectors, and is it not rather hard that your remarks should apply to these equally with the others?—I understand that, but my remarks are not intended to apply to the good ones; but by rule all are subject to removal.

The CHAIRMAN.—That comes back to what I ask, would you make a selection?—

Mr. HARRISON.—Miss Mahon says inspectors are responsible for the trouble.

22934. Mr. HENLY.—Do you know have any changes been made in the Connell circuit?—I heard from an inspector that there was going to be a general removal all over the country, and I concluded that was to save the feelings of the objectionable ones.

22935. My reason for asking you is that I was at Drogheda the other day and I was told that Mr. Yates was removed?—Mr. Yates is one of the gentlemen the teachers would not ask to have removed. We are very reticent about giving any inspector a good certificate because it is the current opinion that in recent years a good certificate from the teachers is the very worst certificate he could have in the eyes of the Board.

22936. Mr. KAVANAGH.—You speak of removal to other circuits, would that be only removal of the troubles?—Don't you think that the gentleman who has got into a lot of trouble in Tipperary will profit by his troubles and by the ignominy heaped upon him and behave better in new surroundings.

19th September, 1915.]

Miss C. M. Manor examined.

[Continued.]

22937. Do you think we have power to recommend particular changes in our report?—I believe it could come in under the head of inspection.

22938. The CHAIRMAN.—I take that to be a general principle. I never understood we had to deal with particular inspectors?—You have to decide for yourselves, I only make the suggestion.

22939. We have not to deal with particular inspectors, just as we cannot address individual grievances of teachers?—I know that.

22940. If we had the power to say here is a particular inspector and we think he ought to be removed it would be different?—You could just say in a general way that inspectors who have given trouble in certain places should for the general peace and welfare of education be transferred.

22941. Then we come to the question of reinstatement and to the case of Mr. Mansfield. I should say at the outset we cannot take any steps to recommend reinstatement. Even Mr. Birrell said he could not do it and said he regarded the thing as closed?—Mr. Mansfield's case stands apart from that of all other teachers. It was upon Mr. Mansfield's case the whole trouble arose and that this Inquiry was granted. We were assured that Mr. Birrell intended to include Mr. Mansfield's case in this Inquiry.

22942. But he excluded it in the terms of reference?—I don't think he excluded it.

22943. I understood Mr. Birrell had said he could not do anything in the case himself, and that this Committee had nothing to do with it except as a matter of investigation?—This is the first time I heard that.

22944. I heard it?—But it was not communicated to you officially, and I think there is not the slightest ground for excluding it.

22945. I am not giving it on any authority?—I am glad you do not give it on any authority for I think that is not the attitude of Mr. Birrell at all. His attitude to us was quite different. He was rushed in the House of Commons into giving that unfavourable reply at first.

22946. He made a reply and he said he had no power in the matter?—I concluded you knew of that, and that is the reason I did not bring a copy of his reply with me.

22947. Mr. KAVANAGH.—What was the purport of his reply?—When Mr. Mansfield was dismissed Mr. Thomas O'Donnell, M.P., asked in the House of Commons for an explanation of the dismissal and demanded his reinstatement. Mr. Birrell communicated with the Commissioners, and the Commissioners took some time in formulating and forwarding their reply. During the interval Mr. Birrell was asked a couple of times had he got a reply, and on the very evening that he got the reply he was asked again, and after a hurried reading of the Commissioners' presentation of Mr. Mansfield's case, without any opportunity of hearing Mr. Mansfield's side of the question, Mr. Birrell gave his unfavourable reply that he had no power to interfere.

22948. The CHAIRMAN.—Then the rumour that reached me was true so far as that was concerned?—That was published. In answer to our deputation Mr. Birrell agreed to give the Inquiry into the general question, and I understood that general question was to include Mr. Mansfield's case.

22949. You say you understood Mr. Birrell to mean that the question of Mr. Mansfield's position would form part of the Inquiry?—I don't say I heard that directly from Mr. Birrell, but I understood it was so. Mr. Birrell didn't say that publicly.

The CHAIRMAN.—Nothing of the kind was ever communicated to me.

Mr. KAVANAGH.—We have practically gone into the Mansfield case.

22950. The CHAIRMAN.—We have gone into it, but we have not gone into the question of the reinstatement of Mr. Mansfield. We have gone into Mr. Mansfield's case of dismissal as we have gone into other cases of dismissal to illustrate the general question of dismissal, but it is an entirely different thing to say that by going into that case we understood to recommend his reinstatement or that we have

power to do it?—Is there not a place in the terms of reference where you could bring it in by liberal interpretation?

22951. The BRIDGE OF ROSS.—Unfortunately terms of reference are not subject to liberal interpretation, but the very reverse. In law there are certain things with wide interpretation and certain things with narrow, and terms of reference are narrow?—Would it be possible to ascertain that by communication with Mr. Birrell?

The CHAIRMAN.—Do you know of any precedent for appealing to the head of a department to interpret terms of reference?

Mr. KAVANAGH.—I think it might be done in this case. From what Miss Mahon says she evidently understood that Mr. Mansfield's case was included.

The CHAIRMAN.—She will accept my words that I never had any such communication.

22952. The BRIDGE OF ROSS.—As far as we are concerned we have no authority to consider reinstatement?—Our feeling was very strong that the question of reinstatement was to be one of the recommendations of this Commission.

22953. The CHAIRMAN.—You had better leave the thing in our hands and proceed to the next head. Before we part from this question, however, I should like to read what Mr. Birrell said. I have got a copy here of the *Irish Independent*, 6th October, 1912, containing Mr. Birrell's statement in which he promises a limited Inquiry. The Chief Secretary in his reply stated that "the deputation was a very formidable one, and represented a united body of opinion—Catholic and Protestant, North and South—which he felt unable to resist. He regarded the whole question from an educational point of view, for, of course, nothing could be plainer than that dissatisfied teachers could not produce satisfactory educational results. So far as the inspection system was concerned, the Chief Secretary remarked that it was not surprising that after eleven years such a system should require careful examination with a view possibly to reconsideration of same, at all events of its features. It was a system which placed great powers in the hands of the inspectors, and it was not surprising that dissatisfaction should have resulted from it. He deprecated any examination into the whole administration of the National Board, and thought that the terms of reference should be no wider than was necessary to include the whole relations of the Board with the National teachers of the country. This would enable the Commission (or Committee) to enquire into, not only the inspection system, but the rule-making powers, appeals and the like. The question as to whom the Committee should consist of was, indeed, a difficult one. His own opinion was that it should be a purely educational inquiry not having reference to any particular outbreak of feeling or resolutions from public bodies or anything of the kind. It should be directed to the object of recommending the very best system of inspection, and all the other matters that would be included within the terms of reference. He promised to consult the National Commissioners as to the terms of reference, and stated that he would take no final step without consultation with persons of educational authority on all sides." You see the Chief Secretary's own opinion was that "it should be a purely educational inquiry not having reference to any particular outbreak of feeling or resolutions from public bodies." In view of that would you drop that question or proceed? Of course, you have a perfect right to proceed to express your views?—Mr. Birrell said in that statement "that dissatisfied teachers could not produce satisfactory educational results." Well, while Mr. Mansfield remains undisturbed there will be no dissatisfied teachers and there will be no satisfactory results. I put that view before you, and I hope you will do your best to interpret the terms of reference in such a way as will enable you to recommend the reinstatement of Mr. Mansfield, for nothing less would satisfy the teachers.

22954. Would you not be satisfied if we left it as open question to-day?—Oh, yes.

22955. You do see the difficulty of the position?—Yes.

22956. And you are prepared to leave it an open question for to-day?—Yes.

22957. Mr. HENRY.—For to-day only?—Yes.

22958. The CHAIRMAN.—Now we come to the next head in your process. "Rules should be published—notice given, laid on Table of House of Commons for 40 days"—Yes. The rules of the code and of administration should be published. Rules affecting increments and promotion and all the details of administration affecting the schools should be published instead as at present with one set of public rules and another set of private rules by which details of administration as regards pay and promotion are acted upon.

22959. There is one question that arises. I am not a skilled official at all on this matter, but I heard it suggested that it might be convenient or possible to publish all the rules of the office for the conduct of particular officials in their department. You would have all these published?—I would have all the rules published so far as they relate to the teachers and the schools.

22960. For instance, you mean the rule that was cancelled so long, or not published for so long, that it takes three "v.g.'s" to secure one promotion. You did not know that until we published it?—I did not.

22961. You refer to rules like that?—Yes. Of course, rules that effect details of office administration and do not affect us we do not expect to have published.

22962. Your statement is that rules of the office, so far as they affect the interests of the teachers, should be made public, that is what you mean?—Yes.

22963. Mr. HENRY.—Antecedent to 1900 the rules were clear and definite with regard to schools. They laid down the exact conditions upon which schools should be judged?—Yes.

22964. The CHAIRMAN.—They were definite?—They were very definite with regard to the promotion of teachers. And then the vested rights of teachers should be respected with regard to every new rule, and no new rule should be retrospective in such a way as to injure any of the existing teachers.

22965. The HONORABLE MEMBER.—Do you include in that their future prospects?—Yes. The future prospects of existing teachers. In every department of English legislation such provision is made. When the Excise and Customs were amalgamated provision was made that no Civil Servant was to be injured.

22966. Even with regard to his future prospects and promotion?—Every case of probable injury to the individual was considered.

22967. The CHAIRMAN.—One or two witnesses, it seems to me, assumed such interests upon hypothetical considerations. It would be very hard to assume the actual value of these interests that ought to be protected all through under a new system. Where their promotion or increments depend upon their own conduct that could not be anticipated. You see that their future depends upon their skill and conduct?—Yes.

22968. But you cannot be assured of that; the average man may break down, unfortunately?—That would be a special case that would need special consideration, but as you went along you should make provision for such cases on general principles. For instance, with regard to Rule 137 (b), it injured the prospects of existing teachers, it lowered the grade salary of some teachers. That rule should not have directly injured the rights of existing teachers.

22969. As regards the rights of teachers whose numbers have been lowered from 50 to 35, the utmost you could possibly guarantee such a teacher would be the salary he was getting when his school was at 50?—That would not satisfy us. We claim the promotion to which he would be entitled when his school was 50.

22970. That is his promotion four or five years hence when he got the proper market?—Yes.

22971. That is a case I was wondering could you stand over. Supposing he did not get those marks, and suppose that school remained with the average, you want to guarantee his promotion though he does

not get the marks required?—If he did not get the marks required he would not get promotion on the average of 50. We do not claim that unless the service was satisfactory. Take a teacher with an average of 50 under the old rules; he was eligible to go to the maximum of the first grade. Suppose you lower his average to 35 by 127 (b), he goes on and his school gets three "v.g.'s," we claim that that man should get the promotion he would have been entitled to if his average was at 50.

22972. You ask for promotion under certain conditions?—Yes.

Mr. HENRY.—Where a teacher fulfils the conditions that would have entitled him to increment, provided he had 50.

The CHAIRMAN.—I am glad that is brought out.

22973. The HONORABLE MEMBER.—Would you use the argument 30 years hence. If a teacher says when I entered the service there were such and such fees to which I might attain. These fees have disappeared; if they still existed I would have got them, and now my prospects are injured?—I never heard any such argument as that; it is a purely hypothetical case.

22974. Such things have occurred in other branches where fees were established and have disappeared, and if they existed numbers could have attained to them?—I cannot contemplate circumstances in which that would arise.

22975. There are certain cases in which a teacher might be injured, but in which you would not think there was a grievance?—You are trying to put something into my mouth that I do not wish to say until I understand it more clearly. It is very difficult to deal with hypothetical cases 20 years hence.

22976. We have things turning up now 10 or 14 years after the event?—But the injury has been going on—the injury to the transition and undergraded teacher is not an injury 20 years hence, but one going on ever since the change was made in 1900.

22977. The CHAIRMAN.—There were over 8,000 teachers undergraded in 1900?—I think 4,000.

22978. Dr. Starke admitted injustice was done to a large number of teachers, but he said they were trying to redress it slowly, and that some hundreds had already got compensation. Are you aware of that fact?—I never heard of the compensation.

22979. He admitted a great many cases are open still?—I am glad to hear it.

22980. For instance, Mr. Millar got compensation for being undergraded?—Is it not an extraordinary thing that that man was agitating for twelve years, and presented his case in every possible aspect to the Board and was refused compensation until he came here and gave evidence? Does not that strike you as extraordinary?

Mr. HARRISON.—We heard another story.

22981. The CHAIRMAN.—Your Organisation informed us that the claims of 500 will eventually be discharged?—It must be Dr. Starke informed us of that.

He said they admitted certain injustice, but the cases had to be investigated, of course, and that where injustice was proved he thought that compensation would be made.

22982. Mr. HENRY.—It was said that there were 8,000 cases in the beginning?—The cases have been diminishing gradually since then. Some have died, some have left the service, but there are at least 500 at present that have well grounded financial grievances.

22983. Have they been informed that their claims are being considered?—Oh, no. They never got any information like that. When a claim is refused you are notified that after the fullest consideration by the Commissioners they don't see that you have suffered any loss. I have a case of an undergraded teacher who sent in a claim. The financial experts went into it and they produced a long statement showing that he was not entitled to any compensation. We went to Mr. Birrell with these undergraded cases. He asked for six different cases; we gave them, and he sent them to the Board. The financial experts went at them and broke them down; we sent three more and the same thing occurred; but we were not given the

figures upon which the claims were refused. If we had got the full information, we might be able to refute them; but we were handicapped in that way.

22984. The CHAIRMAN.—We come now to your point about having the new rules laid upon the table of the House of Commons for 40 days. That is a statutory regulation under the Intermediate Board. You know Dr. Sturdie's answer to that?—No.

He said that would be all very well if you had a Minister of Education who had control over the National Board, and who could defend it in the House of Commons, but there is nobody in the House of Commons to defend the National Board, and in fact they are always leaving it in the lurch.

Mr. CORRIE.—How is the Intermediate Board defended?

22985. The CHAIRMAN.—They have nobody in the House of Commons?—Is it not better to be thrown over in the House of Commons than to have the whole country convulsed for years. Under the National Board it is difficult to have the rules defended under the present system of framing them.

22986. The BRIDGE or ROSS.—The present system means the present system of Parliamentary government?—If the National Board would take counsel with the teachers and everybody interested, and would come to an understanding with all parties, things would be much better done. Before they decide upon the rules they should be laid upon the Table of the House.

22987. Instead of that would you be satisfied with their publication in the *Gazette* of the intention of the Board to make a new rule upon a certain matter?—No.

22988. Have they done that?—No; but they put the rule in the papers when passed.

22989. But I speak of the intention of the Board to bring in such and such a rule?—That would be very little use to us.

22990. But suppose the Board as a Board were ready to receive representations from persons concerned?—You would smile if you knew the value set upon the representations by the Board. At the time of the Birtell grant they were asked why they settled upon the mode of distribution proposed by them, and they replied that they took into consideration the views of the teachers which were forwarded to the Board when our teachers had sent in any views.

22991. Mr. HENRY.—The proposition Miss Mahon is making is that before changes would be decided upon the Board would enter into conference with the teachers, managers, and all concerned, and hear their views, and hear at the same time the possible objections to the proposed changes, and the possible modifications that might be suggested, so as to make them more in harmony with the wishes of the country, and if that was done I think a good deal of tumult and agitation that has arisen would be obviated?—And that all the parties would come to a harmonious understanding about the new rules? Laying them on the table of the House would then be little more than a matter of form, because no one would raise an objection when all parties were satisfied.

22992. The CHAIRMAN.—There is this additional objection to laying them upon the table—a person interested might whip up members and carry a resolution which might throw out very good rules. That is conceivable?—Yes, but you have to balance the advantages against the disadvantages. The advantages would be that rules would not be sprung upon the people that would be injurious to education and cause tumult in the country.

22993. The only thing I wanted to ascertain is are you wedded to this proposal of laying the rules upon the table for 40 days?—We have asked for that over and over again.

But would you not be satisfied with some other form of publication that would let everybody know?

22994. Mr. HENRY.—Supposing a rule was published after a conference saying it was the intention of the Commissioners to put it into operation after the lapse of a certain time, would not that meet your wishes?—

It would not, while the present Commissioners remain. A conference with them might not be very pleasant or harmonious, and they might not meet our views so well, and I would not like to give up the protection of the laying of the rule upon the table of the House of Commons, and the advantage of getting members of Parliament to raise questions in case of a vicious rule.

Mr. HENRY.—But when you have a vicious rule published in the *Gazette* would it not still be open to members of Parliament to ask questions about it and to raise objections in the House.

The CHAIRMAN.—Miss Mahon requires that no rule shall have any force until it has for 40 days upon the table of the House.

22995. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Is it a very good protection laying it on the table of the House of Commons?—If that were enforced it would be a legal requirement. The other suggestion about a conference between teachers and managers and the Board is a suggestion that would not have any legal force behind it. I would not like to give up a legal security for a voluntary one. I should like to have both if I could, but I should like to make sure of the legal one as my rate. I should not like to give up the suggestion of laying the rules on the table of the House, because it has been advocated by the Organisation for some time.

22996. The CHAIRMAN.—Then you come to the question of new rules published and official precedent wiped out. What does that mean exactly?—I see it is said by some of the officials that when they arrived in conference on a decision upon certain matters, they were guided by official precedent. I hold that most of these official precedents in the office are injurious to the teachers and that they should be done away with, and that the teachers should be treated exactly according to the published rules.

22997. Is it possible to lay down rules when those points arise for everything? Must you not follow precedent sometimes?

Mr. HARRISON.—My experience is both outside and inside, that the demand which is now made by Miss Mahon could not be effective and might just as well be left out.

The CHAIRMAN.—I am a little afraid of it.

Witness.—I think they might begin to make new precedents under a better state of things.

22998. The length of work in an office must create precedents; there must be uniformity, or else you will have injustice?—How would you deal with a bad precedent?

22999. Mr. CORRIE.—Perhaps they have some good ones?—I would chance that and wipe them all out.

30000. The CHAIRMAN.—What you propose is that the office should start absolutely fresh?—Yes, with a clean slate.

30001. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Scarcely official precedents ought to be according to the rules, and not against the rules?—They leave a lot to the official interpretation, and if you had rules that would achieve everything there is always this danger.

30002. The CHAIRMAN.—Like Mr. Harrison, I do not think your suggestion in this instance is feasible?—We have not discussed this matter in our Association, we have not come to any decision upon it, but it is my conviction that all the official precedents of the present Board should be wiped out.

30003. You don't take the responsibility of leaving it out?—No.

30004. Then you come to the question of censure on teachers?—What I want to say about that is that a teacher should not be censured without giving that teacher an opportunity of defending himself and allowing the teacher to see the inspector's report and the charges made against him upon which the censure was ordered, so that he might make his defence, and in every case there should be an appeal.

30005. Is the reprimand forwarded to the manager without asking the manager for his opinion, or the teacher for his explanation?—Yes. I got a reprimand once; the inspector came in and I was supposed to have my roll called at 11 o'clock, it was 10 minutes past 11 by my watch which was lying on the desk, and

I got a reprimand for that, the manager got a circular telling him to give me a reprimand for not having the roll marked at the proper time.

23008. You had not opportunity of giving an explanation?—Oh, no. I was not asked for any explanation.

Does that reprimand remain at the office?

Mr. HENLY.—Oh, yes, it is there for ever.

The CHAIRMAN.—Would it seriously affect the teacher?

Mr. HENLY.—It would if the teacher was looking for promotion.

The CHAIRMAN.—If it was of a serious nature?

Mr. HENLY.—It would affect her in any case; for instance, if Miss Mason were applying for a model school, that record would be up against her.

The CHAIRMAN.—And she would be regarded as unprofessional?

Mr. HENLY.—They would put a serious construction upon it.

The CHAIRMAN.—The reprimand is issued by the examiner?

Mr. HENLY.—So it appears, and signed by the Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Parker said it was first issued by signed authority, and that it must pass through Mr. Dilworth's hands.

Mr. HENLY.—He signs them among a bundle of documents as a matter of form.

The CHAIRMAN.—That reprimand goes to the manager and is by him administered to the teacher?

Mr. HENLY.—It is handed over to the teacher by the manager, and that is the first the teacher knows about it.

23009. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you any instance, Miss Mason, of the effect of these reprimands upon a manager's mind as regards the teacher?—I know it had no effect on the mind of the manager in any case; but in some cases if the managers are not getting on well with the teachers, it might mean a very serious business if they were reprimanded for anything more serious than that.

Mr. CORRY.—Getting a reprimand at all might prove very disagreeable, especially if the teacher was not friendly with the manager.

23008. The CHAIRMAN.—Have you any recommendation to make about reprimands to teachers?—The recommendation I have to make is that none should be administered to the teacher until the complaint is submitted to the teacher, and that he should get an opportunity of defending himself before the reprimand is issued.

23009. Who are to judge of the value of the teacher's explanation? Is it the Office Committee?—Yes, the Office Committee could do it, if not a serious matter.

Mr. HENLY.—Or two chiefs of inspection?

23010. The CHAIRMAN.—I am assuming this constitution which Miss Mason suggested, and a strong Committee might be trusted to judge of the value of such explanation?—Yes, the manager would forward the explanation on behalf of the teacher as well as his own comments and they would go up together, and then the Office Committee could judge of them, and if the Office Committee referred them back to the inspector, and if he maintained his charges or made further charges, the teacher also should have an opportunity of defending himself again.

23011. The trial would still be left with the Office Committee? It would not come up to the Sub-Committee of the Board?—Not at that stage.

23012. Unless there were a great many reprimands in the year?—Yes. Good inspectors seldom have complaints, they get on smoothly with the teachers, and they try to avoid reprimands, and they are successful.

23013. I should say the inspector does not want to reprimand. He would, however, write a report with a reprimand where it was deserved. Let us go on now to the assistants?—Before 1900 assistants were permitted to go to the highest class, and had salaries as far as second class, while still assistants. When they became principals they were eligible at once for

the income of the position to which they were promoted and for the salary of their class. The assistant at present cannot get salary even to second class, as under the old regulations.

23014. The assistant may be able to rise, say, to the first of second, but would still get the salary of Grade 2?—Yes. Under the old regulations the assistant could rise to the very highest pinnacle.

23015. That would be promotion in his case?—Yes, and he could get salary up to the maximum of second; that is as much as he can reasonably hope for; we are not asking for anything but what is reasonable. One of the advantages of that to the assistant would be that an assistant of the first class would have a tremendous advantage in applying for a principality.

Had they that advantage under the old system?

Mr. CORRY.—Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN.—Every assistant had to be first class in trying for a school.

Mr. CORRY.—Oh, yes. If a manager desired to get a well-qualified teacher he would at once take a first of first man before he would take a third class assistant.

23016. The CHAIRMAN.—Assistants now remain in the third grade?—And on that account we hold they had a far better chance of promotion to principality under the old rules.

Mr. HENLY.—In 1900 the Board returned 99 men and 64 women assistants in the first division of first class; 110 men and 186 women in the second division of the first class; 364 men and 748 women in the first division of second class, and 195 and 257 women in the second division of second class.

The CHAIRMAN.—I think I heard that some recent arrangement was made for advancing the assistants to a higher grade than third.

Mr. HENLY.—Yes, a few—two in twelve years.

23017. The CHAIRMAN.—Yes, that was it, two in twelve years, and 60 in the last few months. What are the conditions of their getting raised now?—In exceptional circumstances assistants are eligible for promotion on special consideration by the Commissioners. That is not the exact wording of it.

23018. I know what you mean; I remember the rule now, it is rather indefinite?—It leaves the thing in the hands of the Commissioners, and it is most indefinite. Two assistants were promoted in 12 years under "special consideration," now since the recent trouble started 50 or 60 were promoted, and rules have been formulated for the promotion of assistants under that special consideration clause since August, 1912.

23019. New rules have been issued?—New regulations have been framed; there were no existing rules, and the new ones have been framed since August, 1912. Mr. Dilworth told you that in his evidence, and this was the first time we had it officially, that six "very goods" were required for an assistant.

Mr. HENLY.—An assistant could be promoted to the principality of a school if he had six "very goods."

23020. The CHAIRMAN.—Are these personal marks?—Yes.

23021. And hitherto that rule has not been known to the teachers?—Promotion has been claimed by our Organisation for assistants on ordinary promotion on the same ground as the principals with payment as far as the maximum of the second class.

23022. Would that demand of years involve additional expenditure?—Necessarily.

23023. And have you any idea how much?—It was calculated when we made that demand in 1908 that it would take £8,500.

23024. The BRISK OF BOSS.—Do you think £8,000 would do it?—That was the amount calculated at the time, and we have not seen any new calculations since.

The CHAIRMAN.—Of course, you have estimated that on reckoning a certain number of them without any great certainty.

The BRISK OF BOSS.—You will find a certain number of assistants on top of both grades, both men and women; would this move of yours give them promotion?

23025. The CHAIRMAN.—That would depend on certain reports and marks?—Under my new scheme they would be eligible for promotion by efficiency and scholarship.

23026. The CHAIRMAN.—Automatically?—Yes.

23027. The BISHOP or BROS.—In the appointment of assistants to principalships don't the managers generally inquire, and take into consideration, when they left the Training College, and whether they came out in the first, second, or third division?—I have never heard of that, but it may be.

23028. I can tell you it is so?—Some managers may do that.

23029. You are aware that before the appointment of a teacher is made the candidate's qualifications have to be submitted to the Bishop amongst the Catholics?—Yes. I got an assistant recently and her qualifications were submitted to the Bishop, but there was nothing about what grade she came out in or what marks she got. We asked could she teach certain subjects, and those were the qualifications put before the Bishop. We had several candidates, and the candidate that had the qualifications we wanted—that is Music and Irish—got the place.

You wanted special qualifications, Music and Irish, and therefore you had to select a candidate with those conditions, though in the matter of general education she might have come out on the first division or second division.

23030. The CHAIRMAN.—You have raised a question here that interests me a good deal, that in the share the principal has in the appointment of the assistant, because his fate depends a great deal upon that assistant, and we have been told that he has to share in the appointment; you seem to say that you had?—I consulted with the manager and in my case I have a very kind and considerate manager.

23031. Then that means that you had a share in the appointment?—It means that he was kind enough to consult me.

Mr. HENRY.—I never heard a manager applying for a teacher referring directly or indirectly as to what grade or class they came out on, and I have known a great many.

The CHAIRMAN.—It is very strange that that should be so.

Mr. HENRY.—As a rule what they look for is to get some one that will play the organ in the church and teach singing.

The BISHOP or BROS.—Miss Mahon knows that in our part of the country, or at any rate in many of our churches there is no music to take charge of on Sundays.

23032. The CHAIRMAN.—If a manager could import a young lady who could play the organ I think he would be doing very great service in his parish. Now, as to undergraded teachers, you told us a good deal about that already?—The only point I want to make in addition is, that undergraded and transition teachers, even in the absence of financial relief that they claim, ought to have their qualifications restored. Some of those undergraded teachers were first of first, and now they are third grade, and they claim to have their old qualifications restored, and that they should be permitted to remain them to the end of their careers. That does not involve increased finance.

23033. The CHAIRMAN.—Have we the power to recommend that?—I make that suggestion; it is one of our demands.

23034. The BISHOP or BROS.—To tear up again what was done in 1900 is not within our terms of reference?—Mr. Birrell said certain things break down after a certain number of years, and the system introduced in 1900 wanted inquiring into its whole working now, so that this inquiry is strictly concerned with the system of 1900, even according to Mr. Birrell's own words.

The CHAIRMAN.—That would involve a review of the Board's whole career very back beyond 1900?

Mr. HENRY.—I am sure I saw a statement somewhere that in the books of the Office they have entries there of a man's qualification as well as his grade under the new system.

The CHAIRMAN.—They keep entries there of his qualification under the old as well as the new system?

Mr. HENRY.—Yes.

The CHAIRMAN.—Under the old system he got his qualification purely by efficiency?

Mr. HENRY.—In some cases purely by efficiency, because a teacher to get promotion had to have seven consecutive reports for highly efficient service. In other cases it was a case of efficient service plus ex-

23035. The CHAIRMAN.—At any rate, Miss Mahon, you place that recommendation in our hands?—Yes.

23036. Now you come to the question of paper promotion and standard numbers. You wish to abolish both?—Yes.

23037. The Board could abolish paper promotion, but could they abolish standard numbers?—That would involve a two in expenditure.

23038. Supposing standard numbers were retained would you abolish paper promotion?—Oh, no; paper promotion is better than none.

23039. The BISHOP or BROS.—Is it not the cause of dissatisfaction and discontent?—Yes; but would it not cause more dissatisfaction and discontent if you had teachers eligible for promotion who did not even get paper promotion?

23040. The CHAIRMAN.—So you would keep paper promotion?—I would not agree to the abolition of paper promotion. It has its advantages. Supposing a teacher was not promoted until a vacancy occurred, a report might come in the meantime which would show that teacher out of promotion, whereas if he gets paper promotion he is eligible for the vacancy, and has his promotion secured. I just merely mention that to put forward the claims for the abolition of standard numbers, although I know the difficulty is those about standard numbers and the increase in the grant so far as your terms of reference go. Then the "tone" circular should be abolished as a chief factor, because "tone" was always recognised in a secondary place in a report of a school.

23041. What is the meaning of your next point, "Appeal and Report Cancelled"?—I mean that in case of re-inspection, for instance, if the re-inspection results in a favourable report to the teacher the adverse report should be cancelled and the favourable report substituted. That is not the case at present, and I say that should obtain as a matter of simple justice for the teacher.

23042. After inspection or re-inspection, though the former report is discredited, it still remains?—Yes, under the present regulations, and I only say that that report should be cancelled and the new and favorable report substituted for it.

The CHAIRMAN.—What do you think of that, Mr. Harrison?

Mr. HARRISON.—It is absolutely obvious.

The CHAIRMAN.—Why retain the old report?

Mr. HARRISON.—I cannot conceive; we have had evidence that it has been done, just as we have had evidence that in certain cases in Belfast and Clonmel, that although on re-inspection the re-inspecting officer did not agree with the district officer, no change was made in the mark, and the old marks were left standing. In cases of re-examination and re-inspection, if the verdict of the original reporting officer is reversed on appeal, his report ought to be cancelled. It is quite clear. I do not think we need labour the point.

23043. The CHAIRMAN.—Now you come to the question of "organisation and inspection, and practical illustrations as to how to carry out the change"?—Yes. The inspector should never recommend a change of organisation in a school without giving a practical illustration of how to carry it out, and that brings me to the question of the appointment of inspectors.

23044. In your experience, do inspectors not even give examples of how they would wish a subject to be taught by taking the class themselves?—That is a different matter. I very rarely saw an inspector giving an example of how classes ought to be taught. An inspector ought not to come into a school and recommend you to change the whole method of organisation, on which you expended considerable time, and that without removing there for a day or two days or a week, and showing you, by taking charge of the school, and conducting it on the lines suggested, how it should be carried out. You may not be able to carry it out successfully, and the next time he simply finds fault or gets you reprimanded for not carrying out the inspector's suggestions with regard to the reorganisation of the school. He should not recommend any such reorganisation without giving practical illustration as to how it should be carried out.

23045. In fact, he should take the place of the teacher for an hour or so?—Or for a day.

23046. Mr. HENRY.—Would not the suggestion be met in another way, that permission to organise by the Commissioners in these various circumstances should be made a reality?—Yes; that would meet the case in a broader and a wider way, and the inspectors would not have the power to embarrass us.

Mr. HENRY.—If you were allowed permission to organise it should be definite, and I think if we could get what we want on the lines on which the Commissioners are working we would probably have less difficulty.

23047. The CHAIRMAN.—Is it not conceivable that you might get a very brilliant inspector, who would suggest good ideas to you, whereas the actual controlling of a class is only gained by experience?—His ideas might be impracticable, and if his ideas were impracticable there should be no compulsion on the teacher to carry them out.

23048. I confess I think permission to organise within limits would be a safe suggestion?—It would include what I am dealing with here.

23049. The BRIDGE or BEE.—You could hardly possibly expect every inspector to be as well made up in the actual work of the school as a teacher; it would not be merely a question of training him in school work, but he should spend many years at school work?—Your suggestion proves the need for teaching experience.

23050. You have all the various positions in life where things are done by really brilliant men. A really brilliant man in the army might make a very poor private soldier of the line?—But they have a rule in the army now that every one must have a certain training in the ranks before he gets a command, because they found that the gentlemen who went without that, and were put in charge, failed.

23051. But will that gentleman be able to do as good work at the bottom as at the top. I question it. I don't object to the inspector getting some teaching training, but to expect he should come into a school, and be able to teach all classes, is, I think, carrying it too far?—The officer in the army has to work as well as the soldier, and he should have experience and know how the work should be done in the ranks.

23052. You want him to do the thing in the presence of the teacher, but he may not be able to teach as well as the teacher?—Well, that would prevent him from making wise suggestions in the future.

23053. The CHAIRMAN.—You say that the observation book should be abolished?—Yes.

23054. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Is it not useful to the manager?—Well, of course, the inspector is supposed to call upon the manager.

23055. But he does not?—But why not obey the law?

23056. I didn't know it was the rule; but managers complain that they get no written information about the inspector's visit, and I think this observation book kept as a result of that?—Well, it is not fair to the teacher to have a permanent record against him of some temporary defect. When that is written down it might look very bad in the eyes of the manager, whereas if the inspector went to the manager the manager might clear up the difficulty, which might be only a very minor thing. The inspector, after each examination, is supposed to confer with the manager, and to talk over minor defects, and would not that meet the case?

23057. Don't you think the teacher would like to hear the little talk that the inspector would have with the manager?—You cannot have everything. I suggest that if the inspector has any suggestions to make to the teacher the teacher could take them down, but he might forget them, in a little notebook of his own, but I would not have every little thing about minor things recorded in the observation book.

23058. The CHAIRMAN.—I understood that you suggested that a very full report should be forwarded to the manager as soon as possible after inspection?—Yes.

23059. If that were done the reason for the observation book would practically disappear?—If that is done.

23060. Mr. HENRY.—In connection with that, you have now more than one observation book. You have one for the District Inspectors, and another for the Organiser of Schools, and you have others for other organisations?—Yes.

23061. Would you abolish the whole of them?—The Organisers don't make any reports, they simply put suggestions in the books. We never get any report that the Organiser makes of the school except what is put down in the observation book. I would abolish all that; the suggestions which the Organiser makes to the teacher should not be recorded in the observation book. They could be put in teacher's own note-book.

23062. The CHAIRMAN.—You would not have the inspectors confined to teachers?—I would have it mainly restricted from the teachers.

23063. I think Mr. Mansfield made the same recommendation; the word "mainly" was introduced?—I would have the inspectors largely or mainly recruited from teachers, and every other inspector should have a certain number of years' experience in teaching, and should have a diploma in teaching. The National teachers will have the National Board's diploma, but any other teacher should not be appointed inspector without having a diploma in teaching. A teacher must have a diploma to be allowed to conduct a school, and it is very curious to see Inspectors who have no diploma allowed to inspect the work of such a teacher. I say, therefore, that every inspector should have a diploma in teaching, and a certain amount of experience in teaching.

23064. Would you allow a University degree or honours of that kind to count in selecting an inspector?—If a University degree would include a diploma of teaching; but he should also have a certain number of years' experience in teaching, so that he would be able not only to inspect, but to point out to the teacher how difficulties should be removed, and he should be able to give practical illustration as to how his suggestions would be carried out.

Mr. HENRY.—You could get a teaching diploma at the University.

The CHAIRMAN.—Does it include evidence of having studied the methods of education?

23065. Mr. HENRY.—It does not. It is perfectly separate. A degree could be obtained at any University without any knowledge about teaching at all. The teaching diploma is a separate thing altogether?—I would make the teaching diploma essential.

The CHAIRMAN.—What I was asking is, if you would regard an ordinary University degree for this purpose as equivalent to a diploma?

Mr. HENRY.—You said yes, and I thought that that was a little mistake.

23066. The CHAIRMAN.—Do you regard training in the methods of education essential?—Yes.

Is there such training now for inspectors. I have asked that question again and again, and never got a satisfactory answer.

Mr. HENRY.—I think you may take it there is not.

23067. The CHAIRMAN.—What is this Rule 103 about promotion for ungraded teachers to the top of the third grade?—Ungraded teachers are not eligible for any increase. I ask that they be eligible for increment at least to the top of the third grade.

23068. Rule 103 (c) says—"Assistant teachers, trained or untrained, who were appointed for the first time on or after the 1st of April, 1908, are ineligible for promotion beyond the third grade, unless in exceptional circumstances, and by the special order of the Commissioners"; but I think you discussed this already under a different head?—Yes.

23069. You have something to say about a living wage?—I think it is a disgrace that a junior mistress or any class of teacher should only have £24 a year. School teachers should have a living wage.

23070. They never get any increase. Is that the utmost?—Only when they get £4 under the Burrell Grant.

23071. The BRIDGE or BEE.—You would advocate their going up to the same level as the ordinary

assistant, that is £53?—Yes, and that they should begin at £36 or £40, or some figure that would give them a living wage.

23071. Would it not be better to abolish them altogether and have nothing but assistants?—Educationally it would be.

23072. And financially is it practicable?—Of course, this financial difficulty would come in, because you would want to get trained assistants in their place.

The CHAIRMAN.—I understood Dr. Starke's argument for the junior mistresses was that they did a great deal of good at very small expense.

23073. The Honor of Ross.—They are regarded as more girls taking care of little boys?—But then they must have teaching certificates.

23074. But they are nurse girls all the same. As long as you have little children of three years of age in the schools you cannot do without them?—These junior assistant mistresses do assistant's work in the schools; they teach the junior division.

23075. The first idea of bringing them in at all was to look after small boys?—Really, it is very hard to know what idea Dr. Starke had in it.

23076. The CHAIRMAN.—Does this finish your statement for to-day?—Yes.

FIFTY-FIRST DAY.—TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 16TH, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—Sir SAMUEL DILL, M.A., J.T.D., LL.D. (Chairman); Sir HIRAM SHAW WILKINSON, LL.D.; Mr. JOHN COFFEY; Mr. JEREMIAH HENLY; Mr. WALTER MCMURROUGH KAVANAGH, D.L.; and Mr. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

Miss CATHERINE M. MAHON, President, Irish National Teachers' Organisation, further examined.

23077. The CHAIRMAN.—Are you ready now to go on with the next part* of your evidence?—Yes.

23078. I see you want it to be published in the Appendix with the Report of the evidence?—Yes.

23079. Do you think it necessary to go through the whole of it, or to call attention to some particular paragraphs, and then to develop them. The first column, for instance, hardly needs reading?—Of course, I intended to commence with that. That is where, as it were, my credentials and those of the Organisation are.

23080. I want to ascertain your views and to see how we should deal with the matter. The impression on the mind of some of us is that the whole of this need not be read, and that you should only deal with the points on which you want to lay special stress. For instance, may I call your attention to one matter under the heading of Methods. We have read all this; do you want to read it?—I do not, but I do not like to choose, perhaps, overlooking any important point.

23081. We don't want you to overlook anything, but I think it would be better if you would single out points to which you want to draw special attention?—Yes. But under the head now, for instance, of "Recognition," I wish to contrast the attitude of the heads of the Government towards us or compared with the National Board.

23082. I quite understand that?—Then, again, I like to say something about the objects and descriptions of our Organisation and its methods. My idea in putting these methods before you was from the suggestion point of view, in considering what reforms you may be able to recommend in the working of the Board, and then if you have any questions to ask me I shall be glad to answer them.

23083. Perhaps, then, you had better deal with the question of methods?—The Sub-Committees of our Organisation make inquiries, collaborate and furnish to the whole Committee a report containing all information available for whatever questions they are appointed to deal with. This is considered by the whole committee, criticised, amended, and published or acted on; probably a deputation appointed to forward the views contained therein. The C.E.C. deputations are freely received and consulted by the Viscount, Vicereine, Chief Secretary, Under-Secretary, Chancellor of the Exchequer, Heads of Political Parties; are invited to conferences with representatives of Public Bodies on Irish Scholarship, and kindred questions. The only body hostile to the

Organisation is the National Board. This Board was altogether inaccessible to the teachers till 2nd October, 1911, and ever since then it can only be approached through an exasperating quantity of red-tape.

23084. Mr. COFFEY.—Has it ever been approached since?—Once. On the 9th of July, 1912, we had a deputation upon the Hibernian question.

23085. The CHAIRMAN.—You were actually in the Board-room with the Commissioners?—I was not on that deputation.

23086. They were admitted to the Board-room?—Yes, and there were nine Commissioners present.

23087. That is the whole body of the Commissioners were accessible?—For the first time in their lives.

23088. That does not refer to a deputation to the Resident Commissioner?—No.

Mr. HENLY.—How did it come about that you were not there?

23089. The CHAIRMAN.—There is a full explanation later on. You say the Commissioners never co-operated with the teachers or identified themselves with the teachers even in demands with which they agreed?—Yes, and I can give instances.

23090. Mr. COFFEY.—That is, in your own knowledge of the Organisation, the Commissioners never co-operated with the teachers in any way?—Yes. And I have instances in which they refused. For instance, on the 6th of February, 1909, we asked Dr. Starke if the Commissioners would form a deputation, either independently or in union with us, to interview the Chancellor of the Exchequer with regard to the increased grants for pensions. He said he would put it before them, and we never heard of it afterwards.

23091. Mr. HENLY.—Although you knew from the reports that they had expressed themselves favorably to increased grants for pensions?—They have, and what is more, they took the credit of getting it when we had it won.

23092. The CHAIRMAN.—I was trying to find out the list of things Dr. Starke claimed to have done?—Yes. I have often seen such claims of his.

23093. You dispute his right to claim some of these achievements?—I do, most undoubtedly.

23094. And you claim for the teachers that they obtained these things?—Yes, certainly, by our deputations.

23095. These are the very things I think that Dr. Starke claims?—Yes.*

* Vide Appendix LII.

18996. Residence, Pensions, Scholarships, Heating and Cleaning Grants?—He has claimed all these in the Board's reports year after year, and he claimed them in his speech in Belfast in 1911, and in Cork in 1912.

18997. Do you affirm he did not give any help to get them?—I do. I affirm that neither the Board nor Dr. Starke gave any help except what they put in their own Blue Books.

18998. They make claims in these annual reports?—They state that they made claims and were refused.

18999. Would not that help your claim?—We never asked them any help from the Blue Books.

19000. Mr. COOPER.—These Blue Books are published as the report of the year, and of what passed during the year?—Yes, and contains expressions of opinion about various things.

19001. The CHAIRMAN.—Your point is that Dr. Starke elaborates those claims?—How?

19002. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—Those claims were put forward in the reports of the Commissioners, and they say that they had applied to the Treasury from time to time. You don't deny for a moment that they did make application to the Treasury when they said they did?—I don't deny that.

19003. So that if we find in the reports in any case that they did apply to the Treasury, or had urged the Treasury to make a further grant or concession of privileges you don't deny that that statement is correct?—I don't deny that the statements are correct, but at the same time we had been agitating for these very things for years before they looked them in their reports.

19004. The CHAIRMAN.—I understood Miss Mahon's point is that the teachers originated those claims and the Commissioners took them up?—Yes, and what is more, if they didn't take them up they would still have been won by our Organisation without them. For instance, when we were agitating about the assistants' tenure and the "swing of ten," it was stated in Parliament the Commissioners did not consider such a course desirable. A deputation went to Mr. Birrell who pronounced the existing arrangement brutal, and when the deputationists came home and announced that they had obtained a promise of the swing, the Commissioners passed a resolution in its favour, and put it into their Blue Book.

19005. Would you explain for the uninitiated the meaning of the "swing of ten"?—Yes. The average necessary for the appointment of an assistant was 50. If the average fell to 49 the assistant was dismissed, so we asked that once an assistant was appointed upon an average of 30 that assistant should retain his position until the average fell below 40.

19006. That is what you mean by the swing of ten?—Yes, that is the meaning of it.

19007. Mr. HENRY.—Do you know any case in which the Commissioners referred to any of these reforms with approval antecedent to the time the teachers won them?—No. After we had agitated often in the face of their opposition and had been successful, they then voted round.

19008. What change has Dr. Starke effected in the question of tenderness?—No change that I am aware of.

19009. Or in pensions?—None at all. They even have a complaint in their present report that the pension question was considered over their heads.

19010. Or in connection with the heating or cleaning of schools. Is not the heating of schools largely due to Her Excellency Lady Aberdeen and the Women's National Health Association?—I know perfectly well the history of that grant, and I know the Commissioners had no more to do with the getting of it than the man in the street. I was on two or three deputations to Her Excellency during the various stages of the negotiations with the Treasury about the Heating and Heating Grant, and I was on a deputation to the Lord Lieutenant, and I know that that grant is due to Her Excellency.

19011. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Who put it into Her Excellency's head? I think Professor Brady was responsible first of all, then we took it up, but the Commissioners had nothing to do with it.

19012. The CHAIRMAN.—Do you know on what particular occasion Her Excellency's attention was first

called on this matter?—Yes. It was at a meeting of the Dublin Education Society some time about 1908, that Professor Brady drew Her Excellency's attention to it, and then the Teachers' Organisation took it up strongly, but they had been agitating about heating and cleaning of the schools for years before that. But they did not take up the question of the special Treasury grant until then. In May, 1908, Her Excellency, with some members of the Women's National Health Association, waited upon Mr. Birrell. That was the occasion on which Mr. Birrell spoke "of the home in the path." The grant materialised in 1909.

19013. Mr. HENRY.—You make a strong statement here, Miss Mahon, namely, "That any concessions" won for education were those that the teachers agitated for, and that those denied were those that the teachers did not support." Are you prepared to stand over that?—I could point out several things. I have thought these matters out very carefully.

19014. The CHAIRMAN.—We were dealing with the question about achievements won, and you claim them for the teachers?—Yes.

19015. And you say the teachers really originated these claims and procured them?—Yes, and got much support from the Government, especially since 1907.

19016. Now, with regard to the instalment of civil rights?—I have explained that in another part of my statement. First, we were prohibited from going to fairs, meetings, or markets, or doing anything in or out of school that would have a tendency to offend any denomination of the children. That was done away with in 1908, and I think it was in 1910 that the teachers were granted the privilege of being accepted on Boards; that is what I mean by the instalment of civil rights.

19017. The CHAIRMAN.—I think we all remember that?—They have been taking away the disabilities bit by bit.

19018. They are not to keep publichouses or shops, and not to attend political meetings?—These are three that remain.

19019. Now, you explained the "swing of ten" and the various improvements of salary?—Yes. The Birrell Grant, for instance, fees for extras restored, arrears, paid, etc.

The Birrell Grant gave £7 a year additional to each teacher.

19020. Mr. HENRY.—That was not only won by the teachers, but it was won in the face of the bitterest opposition from the Commissioners?—I deal with that in my evidence lower down.

19021. And the lowering of the average to 50?—Yes. Some years ago it was 50, then it was raised to 60 and then to 70, and then it was lowered back to 50.

19022. The CHAIRMAN.—When was it raised to 70?—We, it in 1907?—Oh, no; long before that.

19023. You don't mean it was done under this regime?—No; but under this regime we got it lowered to 60 and 50, and then we got the "swing of ten."

19024. You claim that all the improvements in the teachers' position have been won by your Organisation without any help from the Board?—What I mean is, without any practical help.

19025. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—Will you explain what you mean when you refer to the statement that the teachers obtained?—First of all, the Education Grants were distributed as between the Three Kingdoms in the proportion of 60, 11, 9. That method of distribution was changed to a grant on average attendance, and owing to some miscalculations on the part of the Treasury, certain arrears accumulated that the teachers should have got, and didn't get. It was the Most Rev. Dr. Walsh, the Archbishop of Dublin, that discovered the error, and there was a great agitation amongst the teachers, and we sent over a deputation to the Unionist Government, then in power, and in the end we succeeded in getting the arrears.

The arrears, if I understand you aright, mean the sums due to Education in Ireland under the Probate Act.

Mr. COOPER.—That is so.

Mr. HENRY.—The School Grant was to be distributed upon the same basis as the Probate Grant?

19026. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—And the Treasury

16th September, 1913.]

Miss C. M. MAHON examined.

[Continued]

under-estimated the amount that was due to Irish Education?—Yes.

23127. And the teachers, by their efforts, obtained the payment of that Grant by the Treasury; that is the difference between what it had paid and what it ought to have paid, on a proper calculation, and they obtained the distribution of that money to the teachers?—Yes, and some portion of it went to the Pension Fund; I think about one-fourth.

Mr. HENRY.—It is very simple, and it works out in this way. The distribution was made at first between the three countries on the basis of 80, 11, 9—80 for England, 11 for Scotland, and 9 for Ireland. The point was that there was a variable grant in England and Scotland always increasing, and Ireland's share of the grant ought to have been increasing in the same proportion. It didn't increase as it ought to have done, and the arrears accumulated, and the total sum had to be paid later.

Mr. CONRY.—Archbishop Walsh was not at that time a member of the National Board at all?

23128. Mr. HENRY.—No; that was before. (To Witness).—Have you any instances, Miss Mahon, as showing the want of sympathy on the part of the Board, of teachers' salaries being reduced for the few days they were absent looking for these arrears?—I have, and I can show you that those stoppages were not under Treasury regulations.

23129. The CHAIRMAN.—Better let that come in its proper place. You say you want to deal with the relations of the Commissioners with the teachers, and the question whether means of access to the Board are allowed to the teachers, and you go on to tell us of the friendly relations that existed between the teachers and the former Resident Commissioner, Sir Patrick Keenan, and the Right Hon. T. O'Redington?—I desire to make it perfectly clear that the teachers never had any unpleasantness or discord with the late Sir Patrick Keenan or the late Mr. Redington.

23130. Have you any instances of that?—Oh, yes.

23131. Mr. HENRY.—Are you aware of the fact that owing to the friendly feelings the teachers of Ireland entertained for the late Sir Patrick Keenan that on his death they subscribed for and erected a marble bust of him in the Hall in Marlboro' Street?—Yes. I saw mention of it in various places in the Minute Books of the C.E.O. of the Organisation.

23132. I was Treasurer to the movement?—Yes, I am aware that the teachers put up the bust.

Mr. HENRY.—I will tell you a peculiar fact, namely, that when we appealed to the Inspectors, not a single Inspector would give a goot with the exception of Mr. McCranee, Mr. Taylor, who was one of the Secretaries, and Mr. Wm. Molloy; all the rest of the Inspectors gave us no encouragement. I mention that to show the contrast between Sir Patrick Keenan and Dr. Starke, and to disprove the statement that the teachers are willing and anxious to fight with anybody. The most friendly relations existed between the teachers and Sir Patrick Keenan and between the teachers and Mr. Redington.

23133. The CHAIRMAN.—Then as to Dr. Starke's position?—After Mr. Redington's death we asked for a Resident Commissioner, who should be thoroughly conversant with the Primary School system, and who would be willing at all times to take into serious consideration the representations placed before him by the representatives of the teaching body. Instead of this the vacancy was filled by a man whose administration, unfortunately for himself, for the Board, for the teachers, and for education, has been one long period of civil war between the teachers and himself, broken only by occasional truces, during which hostilities were merely suspended, only to break out anew with increased violence on every new provocation. In this warfare the teachers were never the aggressors. They were on the defensive on every occasion, repelling an insult or resisting some violation of their vested rights. In fact, during the 15 years of Dr. Starke's administration the teachers pursued their arduous profession with the sceptre of duty in one hand and the sword of defence in the other. On every occasion the teachers were backed by the country, and Dr. Starke by his Board. The Board, standing on its Charter, defied the

whole Irish people, clergy, laity, and teachers combined, and it was a humiliating position to see Irish teachers forced to fly across the Channel or rush to Dublin Castle to throw themselves on the mercy of English Ministers, to claim as subjects of an English King protection from injustice, and redress of wrongs inflicted by a Board of twenty Irishmen at home. This they have had to do time and again for the last thirteen years. I must say for Mr. Birrell, we have always found him most accessible; he was always ready to receive us without any red tape whatever. I have walked into Dublin Castle and sent up a note asking him to see me about the Dolphin's Barn cases, and he did so at once. You would never get that treatment at the Education Office. You should first make application, to which you would get a formal acknowledgment. Then you would be told your application was to be placed before the Board, and, later on, after another considerable interval you would be asked for a *priori* of what you had to say.

23134. Mr. CONRY.—Didn't the teachers find that Mr. Wyndham was Chief Secretary was equally accessible?—Yes, and I found from the Minute Books of the Organisation that Mr. Gerald Balfour when Chief Secretary was accessible on all occasions, and as for Mr. Lloyd George, he is accessible without any formality, and I might say the same thing of all those in his office, and in Mr. Birrell's office. They are all sympathy and kindness and courtesy in manner, whether giving or refusing. In London in the Treasury we could make appointments with the Chief Treasury Clerks and heads of departments by wire, and they on their part have sent telegrams to our hotels making appointments, and we have had several informal talks with them about our business. Everybody in the National Education Office down to the hall porter exhibits a fluid kindness, even I remarked the sparrows on the lawn seem afraid to chirp.

23135. You say that this is an unhappy state of affairs?—Yes, and it was largely due to the unlimited and unrestricted power placed in the hands of the Resident Commissioner partly by the discontinuance of the Office Committee in 1900, thereby abolishing the check which the two clerks and three secretaries had hitherto exercised over previous Resident Commissioners' judgment but mainly by the minute of 1902 by which the Board delegated its rights, privileges, responsibilities and duties to the Resident Commissioner—a man of Warren Hastings like disposition who "in sympathy with the rights of others and in compassion for the sufferings of others was deficient."

23136. That is an important statement about the Office Committee up to 1900. You know Dr. Starke's account of his position is that up to 1902 he was first the Office Committee himself and secondly the Finance Committee himself and that the others were not members of the Office Committee but were in attendance upon him?—That evidence differs from the evidence given at a previous Commission, and indeed there is no reason to take his word for gospel.

23137. I am only telling you what his evidence was, and he alleges also that there was no fresh delegation of powers to him by the Minute of 1902 and that he possessed those powers before in virtue of his position.—That is not in keeping with the evidence of previous Resident Commissioners at previous Commissions.

23138. What evidence do you refer to?—The evidence before the Manual Commission.

23139. That would be the Povey Commission. Do you understand Dr. Starke denied that?—Yes.

23140. Mr. CONRY.—Dr. Starke, as I took it, managed to get the power into his own hands, the Board had no statutory provisions. You have nothing to go upon except tradition.

The CHAIRMAN.—That was the conclusion I came to.

Mr. HENRY.—Sir Patrick Keenan, at the Povey Commission, stated that any action taken by the Office Committee was taken on the authority of the Resident Commissioner with the officials in attendance. Dr. Starke ridiculed the idea that these men could be actual members of the Board and paid servants at the same time. I suppose the answer to that really would

29th September, 1913.]

Miss C. M. Mamm examined.

[Continued.]

be this, that there are many anomalies connected with the Board, and that might be one, but surely it is no greater anomaly than to see a paid member of the Board with all the authority of the Board delegated to him.

23141. Mr. HENRY.—Looking at the proceedings of the Civil Service with regard to ultimate authority, are you able to suggest or do you know as a fact how their Office Committee was managed. For instance, in case of disagreement between the Resident Commissioner, Chief Inspectors and Secretaries whose view carried it?—That would be another anomaly, because they were not altogether on an equality, and whether matters were carried by vote or not I do not know.

Mr. HENRY.—The proceedings of the Office Committee, according to the evidence of Sir Patrick Keenan, were always laid upon the table of the Board.

23142. The CHAIRMAN.—I want Miss Mahon's interpretation of what the Minute of 1902 actually did?—First of all it gave Dr. Starke a veto upon all appeals, and prevented their going before the Board, unless he wished, and thus led to nearly all the abuse and discontent ever since. The fact is, he has practically gathered all the power into his hands since 1902, and it is open to him to put anything he likes before the Board and to suppress anything he likes.

23143. Before his time did appeals go direct to the Board?—I am told they were considered by the Office Committee, and the Office Committee then put these matters before the Board, and I think that previously, both in Sir Patrick Keenan's time and Mr. Redington's time, everything had to go before the Board, and was actually considered by the Board.

Mr. HENRY.—They had no authority to stop it.

The CHAIRMAN.—Appeals against the inspectors' reports?

23144. Mr. HENRY.—Yes; and they were considered by the full Board. Apart from these technicalities of this resolution of 1902 and the exact legal bearing and all that, can you state from your own knowledge of the working of the organization whether it has made any actual difference in practice so far as appeals are concerned?—I know that appeals are never heard by the Board at all as far as we could see. In fact when appeals were sent up and were refused, the teachers did not know what the procedure had been.

23145. You know from the evidence that it never reached the Board?—Yes. But then we didn't know until Dr. Starke published that Minute of 1902 in the beginning of November, 1912. We never knew why our appeals were not granted, or that they never reached the Board, or that Dr. Starke had a veto on them.

23146. The CHAIRMAN.—That is to say you did not know of the existence of the Minute of 1902?—We did not know how our appeals were dealt with; we were always under the impression that they reached the Board. When a teacher sent an appeal to the office he wrote to any friends who had acquaintances with individual Commissioners, asking them to use their influence with those Commissioners to get his case a favourable hearing when it came before the Board. He never knew his case did not come before the Board at all.

23147. You believe that that resolution of the Commissioners enabling Dr. Starke to decide what matters should come before the Board was wrong?—Yes. It enabled him to smother our appeals altogether.

23148. Mr. CORRY.—Therefore the Commissioners, as a body had no way of knowing there was any discontent existing amongst the teachers?—No; because they are mostly gentlemen who don't read the popular papers, and who are out of touch with the teachers.

23149. At all events they had no official means of knowing there was discontent, because these appeals were kept from them?—No. And, further, when we went out a deputation to Dr. Starke we had no means of knowing that he ever laid a single representative of ours before the Board. Dr. Starke began his administration by sweeping away the vested rights of almost every class of worker he found in the National Education Department, from the vested rights of the highest chief of inspection, whom he found before him in the office, with a lifetime of good service, to the

vested right of the most junior student in the Training College at the time, and he has continued that policy of destruction of vested rights ever since in the exercise of his rule-making powers. How different is the procedure in connection with public bodies. Where schools, for instance, were discontinued in workhouses a number of years were added to the teachers' service to give them either a respectable gratuity or full pension.

23150. You say that where there is any great change in the Civil Service there is always compensation?—To those who suffer?—Yes. There is always ample compensation. Yet Dr. Starke blames the disagreements of his colleagues, the disloyalty of the chiefs, the unprogressiveness of the inspectors, the opposition of the teachers, the condemnation of the managers, the desertion of the Government, for the failure and discontent which characterized his administrative cycle of thirteen years.

23151. Mr. CORRY.—What do you mean by the disagreement of his colleagues?—For instance, take Rule 137 (3). The voting of the Board on that Rule was made known through Parliament.

23152. The CHAIRMAN.—I think Dr. Starke laid chief stress on the divisions at the Board on the Irish language?—He did that in 1900 when only one year on the Board. I have not seen his evidence, and I do not know what he stated, but I am going upon the published evidence.

23153. Mr. HENRY.—One thing he said was that he did not move for the dismissal of certain officials because the Board would not support him?—He ridiculed the managers in 1902 and 1907; he belittled and antagonized the teachers on the same and other occasions; he drove the teachers to desperation by slamming every door leading to the Board in their faces at the most supreme crises in their positions, refused to hear them, and shut out all avenues of redress by constituting himself the Caesar of the Board, his wife Warren Hastings among the Begums. Now, like Hastings, all those whom Macaulay calls "sympathisers," and whom Dr. Starke calls "subordinate," who had to pander to him and to oblige to him, all hasten to join his enemies in accusing him. There must be something wrong when a man finds himself thus universally deserted, opposed and impeached. The Irish News on 4th November, 1912, says:—"He has worsened a system that was radically wrong from the day of its establishment. He has made himself irresponsible, and the teachers should insist on his transference to some other sphere of activity." The other Commissioners as a Board cannot be exonerated or their culpability overlooked in bringing about the present situation. When a vacancy occurs on the Board a man moves every power "under Heaven" to get pulled on, and once he adds the letters C.B.E. to his name, he seems to cast all the responsibility of his honorary and honourable position over on the shoulders of the paid Commissioner, forgetting that his position has its duties as well as its honours. In fact, the only duty the unpaid Commissioner seems to perform is to flat everything the Resident Commissioner puts before them. They invariably support the official, and seem to take no account of the weaker vessel, the teacher, when by virtue of their office they are bound to shield and protect from the harsh, arbitrary, or unjust treatment of all, or any, of the entire staff of officials under their control.

23154. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Do you think there is such a rush to get on the Board?—I have been mixed up in it, and I know of it for many years.

23155. Curious ambition?—For the last vacancy there were 7 or 8 candidates alone.

23156. Mr. HENRY.—There is a very strong statement here, and I should like to know does it represent the view of the teachers that is where you say Dr. Starke has made himself impossible?—It does, it represents the views of the teachers for years past, but they were afraid to say it. Do you think I could say it now, only that I am giving evidence here under the guarantee of indemnity secured by this Commission?

23157. Is that the view of the teachers generally?—It is, and you have it very strongly from Belfast.

23158. The CHAIRMAN.—Now let us get on to the

circular on "Penalties for Inefficiency and Falsification" in 1909?—Yes. In May, 1909, the circular on penalties for inefficiency, was issued; in June the circular re falsification of accounts was issued; not only issued to managers and teachers, but published in the newspapers. I have that circular to hand in.

23159. The CHAIRMAN.—What is the date of Dr. Starkie's appointment?—February 22nd, 1909.

23160. He said with the circular on penalties he had nothing to do; he distinctly said that, and that it was drawn up before he took up office. Do you want to read the circular?—Yes. "The Commissioners of National Education having had before them recently several cases of serious irregularities in the keeping of the school accounts, have ordered that in future when deliberate falsification of school accounts is proved, the minimum penalty to be inflicted on the teacher shall be as follows:—For the first offence—A fine of £3. For the second offence—Deposition in classification except in the case of a third class teacher, who shall be fined three times the amount previously imposed, and be declared indigible for promotion for at least five years. For the third offence—Dismissal from the service of the Board," and this document is signed by the two secretaries.

23161. You say this was published in the newspapers?—Yes; and I do not think it would be published by the newspaper editors unless given by the Commissioners officially.

Mr. HENRY.—If Dr. Starkie was appointed Resident Commissioner on 22nd of February, and that document was issued in May, he cannot disclaim it?

The CHAIRMAN.—I think what he said was drafted before he knew anything about it.

23162. Mr. HENRY.—But it was issued by his authority and under his regime?—This was apparently an innovation of the new regime, and the teachers began to take alarm, for on the 4th November, 1909, the C.E.C. issued the following protest:—"The tendency of the recent circulars of the Commissioners in reference to fines and other penalties appears to be in direct opposition to the concluding words of Rule 173, where, after describing the stamp of man suitable for National teacher, the Commissioners say—these are the persons the Commissioners are anxious to find, to encourage, and to reward. The whole machinery of the Education Office would now appear to be set in motion to find, discourage, and crush out of the service men and women who have brought the National system of education from a thing barely tolerable to a popular, useful, and successful institution, who have in fact brought it from obscurity and given it a career. The circular as to fines for falsification is one, though we deplore the fact of its issue, on which we recommend no action to be taken, as it is only legalising a practice which has always existed."

23163. Do you mean this scale of penalties always existed?—Oh, yes; its publication in the newspapers, however, was not calculated to raise the teachers in public esteem, and consequently must act injuriously on the system of National Education itself.

23164. Mr. HENRY.—You say that the scale of penalties was always in operation?—It was in the rules.

23165. All you knew was that teachers who falsified their accounts would be fined?—Yes.

23166. But you did not know about the scale?—No.

23167. The CHAIRMAN.—Then my question ought to be amended, and I will put it: did you know whether that scale existed before?—No, not the scale but the punishment existed. The Executive circular goes on to say—"the matter is, however, different with the notice as to penalties. The Organisation has never attempted to shield an inefficient teacher, but the power thrown into the hands of an unsympathetic or inefficient inspector, or one prone to fault-finding by the recent circular, is such as can be utilised to drive out not mediocre, but highly efficient and capable teachers out of the service."

23168. That circular is different from that on falsification?—Yes. I handed it in in my evidence last day. The circular continues:—"In fact such a power in the hands of an unscrupulous inspector might be made an instrument of the gravest tyranny." And then they wind up by demanding "that the deposition of

a teacher shall not be sanctioned except on the report of one of the head inspectors, or chiefs of inspection after a re-examination of the schools with the manager present."

23169. That would not be unreasonable?—No. After an interval of a dozen years, since that statement was written, the teachers are still in the subsidiary position of making the same devoted to-day for an appeal to the higher powers, and a fair and impartial trial before sentence, either of death in the way of dismissal, or of punishment by deprivation of increment and promotion is pronounced upon them. As it triumphed two years afterwards, the death of the inefficiency circular proved over a greater calamity than its birth, because the teachers were fired out without any legal procedure or without being given the chance in the circular in pains and penalties.

23170. You say that if that circular had remained in force it would have been better than the system pursued for the last ten years?—Yes. Because it would give the teacher three chances—reprimand, fine, deputation, dismissal.

23171. And you say that that scale is no longer acted upon?—It became obsolete in 1902.

23172. And now a teacher is dismissed without following that order?—After the dismissal of Mr. P. B. O'Sullivan in 1907 it was somewhat revived in a more indefinite form in the Rules.

23173. Has it been pursued in the case of teachers in Wicklow?—No; there is in practice no fixed procedure now; Mr. Mansfield was dismissed right off, without any scale of chances.

23174. That is a different case; it was not for inefficiency?—No; but the Dolphin's Barn teachers were dismissed without following any fixed procedure.

23175. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—In the case of the Dolphin's Barn teachers, were they dismissed without any warning as to their inefficiency?—They got condemnatory criticisms from the inspectors in the Observation Book; the reports were "fair," they then came down to "middling," but they got no warning that they would be dismissed if they did not pull up; they got no legal warning. There was fault-finding, but no formal warning of dismissal.

The CHAIRMAN.—Did they not get word a year before the dismissal came to warn them that the Inspector's report was such that unless an improvement took place serious action would be taken; do you think that warning was not good enough?

Mr. HENRY.—The principal teacher was severely reprimanded, and warned that unless she applied herself to her work during the current school year so as to raise the school to the required standard, the question of removing her would have to be reconsidered, but I think Miss Mahon's point is that there should be a succession of warnings.

23176. The CHAIRMAN.—Did that teacher only get one warning?—She did not get 12 months to pull up.

Mr. HENRY.—In 1906 Miss Connolly's situation was officially directed to this statement, and she was informed that should the next report be of an unfavourable character, serious action would be taken.

23177. The CHAIRMAN.—That would be from one general report to another; one was on the 7th October, 1906, and the other 25th August, 1907.—But the Commissioners have a rule that there should be a thorough examination of all the standards; there is no evidence that such took place when they dismissed the Dolphin's Barn teacher.

23178. It was brought before us very fully already that there was only inspection, not examination?—And thereby the Board violated its own rules. I now come to 1903. Notwithstanding the new atmosphere of the Board, the teachers continued to make overtures of friendship to Dr. Starkie. That they were willing and anxious to co-operate with him, and to give him every assistance, if he had only given them a chance or paid any respect to their vested rights, the following quotations show:—"The teachers were prepared to help Dr. Starkie, and to give him every chance they could; they expressed delight with the change in the system, and were willing and anxious to co-operate with him in carrying it out."

23179. That was expressed by resolution?—Yes, by resolution of the Central Executive Committee, and again at the Congress at Derry in 1900.*

23180. So you say Dr. Stickle got a most favourable start?—Yes; and if the scheme as unopposedly began in Glenorris is now ready for introduction there he has nobody to blame but himself. I bring that out because he is inclined to put the blame upon the managers, teachers and everybody else. On the 6th of May, 1900, the long-drawn battle began. On that day the Teachers' Executive, on the motion of Mr. Philip Ward, now a Commissioner, appointed a deputation to visit upon the Resident Commissioner with reference to the proposed changes in the system. This was met by a refusal, and on the 9th June the deputation was commissioned to proceed to London to interview the Chief Secretary, Mr. Gerald Balfour. On the 14th July extracts from the proposed new rules appeared in the newspapers. This was the first intimation of them the teachers had, as they were hatched with the greatest secrecy at the Education Office. When the teachers saw, among other things, that grading of schools was to take the place of classification of teachers, that the rules were to be retrospective, and that at one fell stroke the classification of almost half the teachers of Ireland, who by study and efficiency, was to be swept away, their consternation may be imagined. I may mention in that connection that teachers living on the sea-board districts of Kerry, round Galway, and other remote places, in small schools, who were first of first class teachers, were all depressed to the third class.

23181. They were all depressed owing to the small size of the schools?—Yes.

Mr. HENLY.—All the salaries were fixed for the grades, and supposing a man had a salary of "X" £ s. he was fixed into the school where "X" came, you took the average of three years.

The CHAIRMAN.—They got the salary of the new third grade owing to the average of their previous three years?

23182. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—They also got the classification of the new grade in place of the old classification, and their complaint was not so much as regard to salary as with regard to classification?—Oh, certainly the lowering of their status.

23183. The CHAIRMAN.—First of all they got the salary of the third grade, and at the same time they fell in classification?—Yes.

23184. What was the number undegraded?—In 1908. About 5,000.

23185. And the number now?—5,600.

23186. I thought someone said 900?—Only 900 still suffer financially, but there are 5,600 undegraded.

23187. Then you sent a deputation to Mr. Balfour?—Yes. The Central Executive deputation rushed to London and appeared to Mr. Balfour. He willingly gave on the 18th July, 1900, the hearing Dr. Stickle refused them, but unfortunately Chief Secretary then, as now, could do nothing but forward their case to the Board, there to be contemptuously spurned, ignored or disregarded. Mr. Redmond and Mr. Patrick O'Brien were present, and the deputationists pointed out to Mr. Balfour that they, though the most vitally concerned parties, had no knowledge of the new rules only what they could infer from the extracts in the Press, but from what these forecasted serious injury would be done to the teachers. The abolition of teachers' classification, was by scholarship and efficiency, and the substitution of school grading based on previous income from the State, would deprive highly-classed teachers in small schools, and all first and second class assistants, of the work which they had attained by meritorious service and success at examinations.

23188. You meant that the abolition of the teachers' classification would deprive highly-classed teachers in small schools?—Yes, and all first and second class assistants. This was contrary to the Board's promise for sixty years, and it was most unjust to deprive a teacher of his class except by operation of the rules in force when he obtained it.

23189. You say that the high averages necessary for the proposed grades would practically shut out the great majority from promotion?—Yes. Under the old rules an average of 35 would suffice for highest class.

23190. I am only suggesting that the word "num-

bers" should follow averages to make it clear?—Yes; that the high average numbers necessary for the proposed grades would practically shut out the great majority from promotion; that injustice would be done in many cases by basing future incomes on previous three years' averages, and that the proposed degradation of a teacher, when the average fell below a certain limit, was a new injustice.

23191. How did the injustice arise under the grading system?—Suppose that the attendance of a school was very low under an old or infirm teacher who was going out, and that the results were very small, and then suppose a new teacher came in and worked up the school for two years, it would not be fair to have two years' results of this very hard-working teacher averaged with the year of the old teacher's results, before the new teacher took up the school.

23192. Is the three years' average the first year might have been under the old infirm and useless teacher when the attendance was very low, then a young vigorous teacher comes in, and for two years raises the average, and he gets his average fixed on these three years, and, of course, loses on the first?—Yes.

23193. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Are you quite sure that is the fact, because in a recent case that came before the Board the average was taken not of the school, but the teacher's own average, in different schools?—Yes, that might be done, and could be done, but in the generality of cases it would not be done. It may have been done in individual cases where pressure was brought to bear with the Commissioners, but it was not done generally.

23194. Mr. HENLY.—Take the case of a teacher in a small school for two years who then goes to a large school for the third year, if the average income was based on the three years irrespective of the school, clearly an injustice would be done to him?—Yes.

23195. And then, of course, even if it was a small school, but a rising school increasing in attendance from year to year and increasing in results, his income would go up?—That would be in progressive districts; there are many ways in which injustice was done.

The CHAIRMAN.—That is the difficulty Sir Hiram Wilson raises.

23196. Mr. HENLY.—I think Sir Hiram is right; I thought the average income was fixed upon the work of the individual teacher for three years?—I will ask Mr. Mansfield about this, because he has special knowledge upon all these points. The proposed depression when the average numbers fell below a certain limit was a new injustice. Hitherto, though he might be paid at a lower rate, he retained his classification. For instance, with a school of 50 average the teacher could attain first grade. If the average fell below 50, according to the new rules he was degraded to second grade, but, under the old rules, he retained his classification even if his income fell.

23197. The CHAIRMAN.—Has not that been modified lately?—It was modified because of the agitation, as in the case of 127(b).

Mr. HENLY.—Looking at Rule 106(c), I find it says, "Principal teachers do not lose their grade on account of the decline of the average attendance of their school, but their salaries may be reduced in accordance with the rules."

The CHAIRMAN.—They retained the grade, but may lose in income.

Mr. HENLY.—Yes.

23198. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Would it be correct to say, Miss Mahon, that under the old system the question of the classification of the teacher did not represent the salary he received?—Yes.

23199. That the classification was personal to the teacher, and that the salary was for the practical purpose of teaching in the school?—Practically, with the exception of the portion of income known as class salary, that was the condition of affairs under the old system.

23200. Would the teachers like to have that system revised so that a man could attain first of first in classification without necessarily receiving a salary of first

of first, but only receiving the salary of the school in which he is placed?—Most undoubtedly, and one of the demands of the students at the present time is that they be permitted to go to the higher grade even if they ask only the salary to the maximum of the second grade.

23201. The CHAIRMAN.—That is, they ask for paper promotion?—As they had under the old system.

23202. The term "paper promotion" is not quite accurate; they would not look upon that and complain of it as a matter of paper promotion?—They did not before 1900; there were assistants who were first of first class, and they could obtain only to the salary of the maximum of the second class. Paper-promoted teachers are entitled by rule to their promotion and salary, and they get it only on paper. Assistants were entitled to go to the highest class with salary only to the maximum of second class according to rule, and they did not object to such a rule.

23203. That would not be paper promotion?—It would not.

23204. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—And they would complain about it as paper promotion?—No; because it would be promotion according to rule. By rule paper promoted teachers are getting promoted now to first of first grade but not getting salary according to the rules. In fact, paper promotion is a violation of the rules.

The CHAIRMAN.—If that is so what I said is right; it is not a paper analogy.

Mr. HENLY.—One point made by Sir Hiram about a teacher in a small school having a small salary was that the salary was attached to the school, but there is a class of salary which is personal to the teacher no matter where he went. Provided he had an average of 35 he was entitled to a salary of £84, in addition to that he was paid by results; the amount of the results which he could earn depended upon two things: first, the number of pupils, and secondly, the proficiency, because while he would only get from 3/- to 5/- from the junior classes, he could make up to 60/- in the higher classes, and therefore where he had a fairly large school and fairly advanced pupils the result fees formed a considerable portion of the income.

The CHAIRMAN.—For more than £84.

Mr. HENLY.—Yes; he would have the aspiration grant for each of his pupils in attendance, and all these three items as were put together.

The CHAIRMAN.—What Sir Hiram said is correct, because it depends upon the size of the school.

Mr. HENLY.—The class salary would be personal to the teacher; he could draw it as long as he had an average of 35; he might be in the first division of first class, but as a matter of fact his result fees would be small.

The CHAIRMAN.—In other words Teacher "A" might be first of first, getting small result fees in a school of 35, while Teacher "B," getting a small salary, might be getting results three times as much.

Mr. HENLY.—There was a teacher in Belfast drawing over £600 a year; teachers in other localities could not possibly earn the same sum.

23205. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—The point of my question is to see whether there could not be some plan by which the salary would represent the school and the classification would represent the teacher, that would not deprive the teacher of any of the premiums given for proficiency?—The only way you could have that is to have promotion of teachers by examination at certain stages in their career.

23206. Mr. HENLY.—The point is, what would you think of a proposal by which teachers could qualify at once? I will take an illustration: a teacher having 30 pupils in attendance could get into the second grade, and could, by performing all the requirements of the Commissioners, rise to the maximum of that grade?—Yes, in income.

23207. Well, then, what would you think of a proposal by which a teacher, say, having an average of 29 pupils, and fulfilling all the requirements of the Commissioners and every consideration except the one of average attendance should be eligible to be promoted to the top of the second grade, and not drawing the salary of the second grade until he had the necessary average attendance?—In other words, you propose

that a teacher in the third grade should go to the maximum of the second grade without salary until he reached the average.

Until he had the requisite number of pupils.

Mr. CORRY.—That would give him promotion with additional salary.

23208. Mr. KAVANAGH.—It is just paper promotion?—I would not call it paper promotion.

Would Mr. Henly describe paper promotion for us?

23209. Mr. HENLY.—Take a teacher who, under that system if it was in operation, got into a position entitling him to one increment in the second grade, then if that teacher got a transfer to another school having an average attendance of over 35 pupils, that teacher would commence on a salary awarded to the particular stage of the second grade to which he had attained?—That is the very point, because that was the method under the old system.

23210. Would that meet your views?—Well, you know, it would be better than the present system.

23211. Mr. KAVANAGH.—It is rather hard to expect Miss Mahon to commit herself to a scheme she has only heard explained?—I can say it would be better than the present system, that it would be a great advance upon the present; and another thing, when a teacher with an average of 29 went to a school entitling him to second grade, he would step at once into the salary of the stage of the second grade to which he had attained. At present if you get transferred from a small to a large school you don't get any immediate increase in income. Under that scheme there are two additions—namely, the addition in classification and the addition in salary.

23212. If we had a modification of that kind, would it not afford a stimulus to teachers in small schools to exert themselves to the utmost to satisfy every requirement of the inspectors except the one they could not satisfy: that of average attendance?—Of course it would, but that does not mean that they are not exerting themselves at present.

23213. But it would afford a stimulus to them?—There are many teachers of the third grade, and no stimulus could make them work better.

23214. The CHAIRMAN.—I think there is something in what Mr. Kavanagh says; it is hardly fair to question Miss Mahon right off; it would not be quite satisfactory until she has time to reflect upon it; these things need to be very carefully examined, and I would not like her to commit herself to something she might afterwards have to retract?—There is not much in the fact of its being a greater stimulus, because I cannot conceive how they could work harder, or how any stimulus could make them work better.

23215. Mr. CORRY.—It would be important to them to have a chance of getting to the higher grade?—I think it would be an instalment of justice, that is how I look at it.

23216. The CHAIRMAN.—Now will you go on to your next point about Mr. Balfour's inability to prevent grievance?—Yes. Mr. Balfour declared he had no power to interfere with the rules of the Commissioners, and said the deputation should have waited on them. He seemed particularly impressed with the injustice of degrading any teacher from present rank, and also with the moderation of the claim that the teacher's confidence should be indestructible, and with the necessity of requiring that the present standard of scholarship should by some means be maintained.

23217. He suggested you should have interviewed the Board?—Yes. When the deputationists came back from London and reported to the Central Executive Committee, the Committee acted on Mr. Balfour's recommendation, and applied to the Board itself. They previously applied to Dr. Sturkie and were refused, and then they applied to the Board to receive a deputation.

23218. And you say the Board replied in its stereotyped phraseology to the effect:—"I am directed to inform you that it is not the practice of the Board to receive deputations."?—Yes, and the Executive protested.*

23219. Now you come to your Executive's opinion of new programmes?—Yes. With regard to new programmes we find the Executive, on the motion of Mr. Philip Ward, expressing the following strong opinion on the same date:—"That the absence of practical

* Vide Appendix E.II.

knowledge in the actual working of a school is so observable throughout the entire programme that we feel justified in recording our opinion that a scheme of this character, so important and far-reaching in its results, should not be finally arranged and issued without consultation with experienced teachers, who are in the best position to judge of its practicability."

I think I am right in saying Dr. Starke would deny that, because he said it was submitted to a large number of experts.

23220. Mr. CORRY.—What is the date of that?—That was in 1900; Dr. Starke did not consult the teachers' representatives.

23221. The CHAIRMAN.—He did not consult the teachers' representatives, but he says he consulted experts on education?—My point is, there was no consultation with the Teachers' Organisation in Ireland, and they asked for it over and over again, and were refused consultation.

23222. The CHAIRMAN.—Then you made a third appeal for an interview?—Yes; like the unfortunate widow they made another appeal to Dr. Starke to secure a deputation on behalf of the teachers. But Mr. Philip Ward and his teacher colleagues met with scant courtesy twelve years ago, and the door of the Education Office was banged in their faces.

23223. What kind of answer did you get?—The usual formal reply. Then giving up the attempt as hopeless the C.E.C. on the 1st December, 1900, on the motion of Mr. Ward, again issued the following protest against their treatment:—"That we have learned with regret and disappointment the objection for the second time of the President Commissioner to receive a deputation from this Committee representing those who will have to put the new programme into operation, in the first instance before the programme was issued that it would be inconvenient to receive a deputation at that stage, and now we are informed that it would be useless to discuss details till the system is at least a year in operation."

23224. Then evidently Dr. Starke replied?—Yes. The protest continues:—"But the result of the first refusal was the issuing of a programme unfair and impracticable in many respects, and the result of the present refusal will be to inflict an injustice on the pupils, teachers, and the country for at least a year, for we can hardly believe that the enormously overcrowded state of the programme generally, and the abnormal extent of its requirements in some particulars, would be permitted to remain if the teachers' representatives got the opportunity of discussing the details, and putting their views before those in authority." And again, on the 25th December, 1900, they declare:—"We most cordially say that we have little faith in a universally tentative and provisional programme. We consider it would be much better to perfect it as far as the experience of managers, teachers, and inspectors could make it perfect. For that purpose we made several respectful applications to the Board and the Resident Commissioner for intervention, but we were refused." On the same date the Executive resolved to cross the Channel again and make another appeal for consideration through the new Chief Secretary, Mr. Wyndham. Thus ended the year 1900, and I submit that it was unjust, unfair, and inexcusable to thus deny the teachers' representatives all means of access to the Board, at a transition period when their professional existence and prospects were at stake.

23225. Mr. CORRY.—And perhaps you might add what is more important, that the education of the children was at stake?—Yes.

23226. The CHAIRMAN.—What point did the teachers specially object to in the new programme? Is it that it is overcrowded with new subjects?—Yes. New subjects that were not capable of being dealt with successfully by the old teachers, such as paper-folding and wire-bending.

23227. Mr. CORRY.—And you might add singing and science and drilling?—Yes.

23228. Mr. HENRY.—And cooking and laundry work for infants?—Yes.

23229. The CHAIRMAN.—Preparations were going on to give the teachers some training in a hurried way at that time?—They were.

23230. Did you yourself go through any of this training in subjects you did not know before?—I went through a course of science, that was about the only thing.

23231. For how long?—For about seven weeks. I went to Berr every Friday evening and came home on Saturday. We had classes on the Friday evenings and all day on Saturday.

23232. Where did you go to?—I went from my own place into Berr.

23233. How far?—About four miles. I left my school on a Friday afternoon about 3 o'clock and went into Berr, staying in the town that night. I attended class that evening and all day on Saturday, and came home on Saturday evening. I think the course was about seven weeks; I filled two books with science and one with object lessons.

23234. Was that chemistry?—It was elementary science.

Mr. HENRY.—Both physics and chemistry.

23235. The CHAIRMAN.—Did you teach after that preparation?—No, and I could not teach it now without another course because I have forgotten all about it.

23236. How many teachers who had preparation like that undertook to teach science?—Some thought that the preparation was sufficient, and they got the necessary equipment. I know I had no school space, and that saved me from having to introduce it. The teachers generally went to these classes everywhere, and Messrs. O'Riordan says, "I have seen teachers, many of them who have families, coming with great inconvenience into towns, and lodging there, in order to attend these organisation classes."

23237. The CHAIRMAN.—I was going to ask you did they pay your expenses?—I had to pay a portion of them; the Board made a grant, but I was refused payment of lodging expenses because they considered I could go home at night and come in next morning.

23238. Mr. HENRY.—Who conducted your science class?—Mr. Rutledge. Later on, I did not attend the cookery course, on this account, they would not pay expenses under four miles. Carrig is 3 Irish miles from Berr, that is 3½ statute miles. No carman will break a mile; once it passes three, he charges for four. The Board would not pay expenses in these circumstances, even lodging expenses—they would expect me to go home in the darkness of a winter's night three Irish miles.

23239. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—You would not like to ask the carman to pay back two-eighths of a mile?—Certainly not, and besides the Board would not allow any expenses at all when under four miles.

23240. The CHAIRMAN.—You were dealing with the resolution of 1900?—During this year, 1900, the Teachers' Executive, at meeting after meeting, sent forward resolutions and statements protesting against the lowering of rank and status under the new system as not less objectionable than change of income, declaring that promotion should depend on service and efficiency, and should be open to all teachers whose schools are maintained in a satisfactory state of efficiency irrespective of number in any grade or section.

23241. We have gone into that at great length?—Asserting that the proposed introduction of the barrier known as standard numbers was calculated to destroy efficiency and to damp laudable ambition, asking for a reversion to the old system of averages under which a school of 80 could have a second class teacher, and a school of 45 first of first, and asking for special consideration for transition teachers. They hoped by means of these, as a last resort, to make their views known to the Board, but all evidently fell on deaf ears and stony hearts. To the closure of the Board against the teachers at this time may be traced a great part of the troubles in succeeding years.

23242. You now come to 1901, and I think you might go on to your statement, "Libel on teachers by Dr. Starke at the Royal University Commission."—I should like to read the repudiation of it by the Teachers' Executive. On the 23rd November the Teachers' Executive declared:—"That we have seen with astonishment and indignation statements published in the Dublin newspapers, from the examination of the Most Rev. Dr. O'Dwyer before the Royal Commission

on University Education, in which the grave charge of writing in the Catholic Press "things that are shocking to anyone who understands Catholic principles, and that are simply revolutionary and socialist, and which, if carried to their logical conclusion, would turn society 'loopy turrey,' have been attributed to the National teachers by the Resident Commissioner. That we repudiate these charges as false and groundless, and that such statements made before a public Commission by the Head of the National Education Department cannot fail to be injurious to the progress of Primary Education, and that they are highly calculated to estrange confidence in Dr. Sturkie's administration of the National Board, and in his capacity of properly directing the public education of the country, in the progress of which the teachers are vitally concerned." This ended 1901.

23243. To whom was that addressed?—It was a published resolution, sent to the papers, to the National Education Commissioners, and to Dr. Sturkie.

23243. He did not make any explanation or reply?—He never explained any insult he offered us.

23244. Mr. CORREY.—That was not only an insult, but was it not a charge directed at all events to the Catholic teachers amongst the country?—Yes. It was an attempt to brand the teachers as socialists and revolutionaries without a particle of proof, and was particularly harmful at the time, in as much as the teachers were just then emerging from trouble with the clerical powers over security of tenure. That trouble had just ceased with the promulgation of the Maynooth Resolutions.

23245. That was the resolution which established the Bishop as arbitrator?—Yes, and we were emerging from the agitation which led to that and from the troubles which arose out of the agitation.

23246. Mr. HANLY.—Has it ever come to your knowledge or the knowledge of the Organisation that any national teachers have been guilty of any of the things charged to them by Dr. Sturkie?—No; and besides, Dr. O'Dwyer attributed them to "disputatious intermediate classes." Dr. O'Dwyer spoke very strongly on the subject.

23247. The CHAIRMAN.—I think he was talking about the spread of superficial information all over the country and the effect it was having on certain classes?—Yes.

23248. Come on now to 1903?—On the 7th January, 1902, the Board's famous minute was passed, virtually giving over to the Resident Commissioner sole control of teachers and inspectors, and practically abolishing all check on his further career. In the letter of Mr. Beaupre Wyse on the 1st November, 1912, he states that, according to the 1902 minute, "outside of general principles, and the clauses of subject-matter to which they are applicable, Dr. Sturkie alone had authority to decide what cases should be submitted to the Board, and that he would not tolerate dictation in this from any subordinate official" (meaning by "subordinate" in this case a chief inspector of 40 years' service).

23249. On what occasion was that letter of Mr. R. Wyse written?—It was in the controversy about Mr. Palmer going to Clonelff; the "subordinate" in this case was a chief inspector of 40 years' service. No teacher knew of the existence of this minute till then, and for 30 years teachers and managers thought their appeals went as a matter of course before the Board. It is open to doubt if three-fourths of the present Board knew of its existence, for of all the members on the Board in January, 1902, only five now remain.

23250. Who are the five?—Sir Henry Bellingham, who became a member of the Board in 1890; the Rt. Hon. the Lord Chief Baron, 1890; Rev. Dr. Evans, 1890; Sir Stanley Harrington, 1895; and the present Resident Commissioner, Dr. Sturkie.

23251. Mr. HANLY.—Was Major Deane not on the Board then?—Not then, and I am not saying that the four Commissioners I have mentioned, leaving out Dr. Sturkie, were present. None of them might have been present at that meeting though they were members of the Board at the time.

23252. The CHAIRMAN.—Now you come to "confidential reports"?—Yes. A confidential report asking

managers to send information about teachers was invented about this time, for on the 28th June, 1902, the Executive by resolution requested the Commissioners of National Education to immediately withdraw from use the form known as the "Confidential Report," as every teacher in Ireland looked upon that form as a humiliation and a personal insult.

The CHAIRMAN.—A clergyman told me this morning he never complied with that rule at all.

Mr. CORREY.—The managers ignored it.

23253. The CHAIRMAN.—Mr. O'Riordan made some comments on that report?—Yes, the circular was considered by the teachers to be very objectionable.

23254. You say that Dr. Sturkie attacked your Organisation in Belfast in 1902?—Yes. In an address he delivered before the British Association he attacked the teachers and their Organisation.

23255. Then you deal with Dr. Sturkie's promise of promotion?—Yes, he stated in that address—"It is our intention to promote the majority of teachers solely on merit. If we find a teacher of exceptional excellence here in third grade, it is within our power to promote him to second grade, or even to first, whether his service be long or short." This might mean anything or mean nothing. That it meant little is apparent from the fact that in 12 years the Commissioners promoted two assistants out of 5,000, though there were over 1,000 vacancies in second grade. If this be the rate of promotion by merit it is even slower than the 36 years' course of promotion by rule.

23256. And then he made an attack upon the teachers?—Yes. He said—"So far from accepting the privilege gratefully, the leading spirits among them assailed the Board in an organized chorus of acerbity, rarely equalled even in this country." This was untrue. The teachers used no acerbity. Dr. Sturkie's admissions in Belfast, 1911, disprove his accusations of misrepresentation in 1902, and proves that the teachers' agitation was then justified, and still more, that he knew at the time he was denouncing it that it was justified. And then alluding to the Central Committee, which he refused to co-operate with, he says that "the great body of the teachers were wiser than their representatives." And then, as a sort of sop to individual teachers, after his attacks on the Organisation, he says: "I never lost confidence in the loyal spirit of the Irish teachers, and I am happy to say it has been justified by results." The loyalty he seems to want is the fidelity of a dog to its master, which obeys unquestioned. The only loyalty the teachers will give is the reasoned and intelligent loyalty of a fellow Christian who obeys through conviction of the rectitude and justice of the command.

23257. Do you think it necessary to read the teachers' protest?—I think it would be sufficient to mention that the Teachers' Executive passed a very strong resolution protesting against Dr. Sturkie's references in 1902.

23258. You also regarded that as an attack on the managers, and you refer to the reply of two of those clergymen?—Yes. Monsignor O'Riordan and Father Conry caricatured him in press and pamphlet. I want to remark that at the time the teachers backed the managers, and passed resolutions in support of them, and that was one of the things Dr. Sturkie never forgave them for, just as he never forgave Mr. Dwyer for his refusal to condemn them in reports. When the new system was fully launched, and the teachers sufficiently chastised in his Belfast address for their criticism, Dr. Sturkie condescended to open the door to the Central Committee, and admitted them to an interview on the Equivalent Grant, due to Ireland under the Education Act of 1902, and from thence he received them till 1905, when the door was shut again during the 127 (b) agitation.

23259. That brings you to the end of 1902, and you go on to deal with the memorial from the transition teachers in 1903?—The teachers who were in training in 1902 had entered the Training Colleges under the old rules, which promised them 2nd class rank at the end of their course on passing examination on a certain programme of studies, but they found when they emerged from training that they were to begin on third grade under the new rules. They made repeated appeals to the Board for consideration, but in vain. In February, 1906, sixty-five of them sent to the Chief Secretary

appeals, countermanded by their managers, adding for an inquiry into their treatment. The Chief Secretary, in reply, declined to order an inquiry, on the ground that the Commissioners had informed him that every case submitted to the Board had been "carefully considered." These teachers are still agitating for redress after the lapse of 12 years, plainly demonstrating the absence of any open effective court of appeal that would dispose of grievances one way or the other. The Board say they are considered, but the method of consideration, or the premises on which conclusions unfavourable to the teachers are arrived at, are a sealed book to the teachers affected.

23250. I suppose that may pass without further development. Your Central Executive, in October, 1903, drew up a programme and presented it to Dr. Starke for his consideration, and it was rejected with the exception of one solitary subject?—Dr. Starke holds that the teachers were consulted in the framing of the programme of 1903.

23251. In that year also the first triennial period ended, and complaints began to pour in with regard to the withholding of increments. Were there many of them?—In 1905 in one resolution 108 are mentioned.

23252. But what about 1904?—The only thing I hear about 1904 is that the Teachers' Executive passed the following resolution:—"That the teachers have observed with much regret, notwithstanding the statement made by the Resident Commissioner at Glasnevin some years ago, that the relations in future between inspectors and teachers would be of a much more cordial nature than hitherto in their professional intercourse with the schools; that instead of kinder and more sympathetic relations the breach is becoming wider and wider between them, and that an undue power rests with the inspection staff under the present regime to injure or promote the interests of the teachers without any effective guarantee of the strict justice or impartiality which should prevail in the official recommendation to the office regarding the interests and promotion of teachers." You see that as early as 1904 those relations commenced. Then in the beginning of 1905 the new rule 127 (b) and Amalgamation rules were published. They had been passed by the Board in May, 1904, on the recommendation of Mr. Dale, the English expert, and incorporated in the rules in December, 1904. Though all was arranged with the utmost secrecy, rumours got afloat, and on the publication of the rules a storm of indignation broke forth which convulsed the country all round from the centre to the sea. The Cardinal, Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Ministers, M.P.s, laymen of all denominations protested in unison with the teachers. As the rule stood at its first publication it meant ruin to the non-teachers' prospects, in many instances loss of all further increments and promotion, in some cases even depression in grade, in all cases where enforced, loss in capitation. Mr. MacSwiney of Loughlin, got his case tested through Parliament, and found that on the enforcement of Rule 127 (b) his salary would at once be decreased by £74 per year.

23253. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—What do you mean by the expression "tested through Parliament"?—We could get no reply from the Commissioners, and the only way to get a reply was through the Chief Secretary in Parliament. Mr. MacSwiney got a question asked in Parliament as to what would happen if 127 (b) was in force in his school, and the Chief Secretary's reply was that his salary would be reduced by £74 per annum.

23254. The CHAIRMAN.—You say the rule is since published in a modified sense?—There have been several modifications of it. The rule as published in 1905 said, "Boys under 7 years of age are ineligible for enrolment in a boys' school where there is not an assistant mistress unless there is no suitable school under a mistress available in the locality." That meant that all boys under 7 were to be taken from the master and sent to the mistress.

23255. The mistress in a neighbouring school?—Yes. And that would mean that the average of the school would be lowered; about one-third of the pupils would leave. The average of the school might then depress the teacher in grade, and his salary would

be reduced in proportion. As the rule stood at first, it swept away the vested rights of the teacher.

We all understand that, but I want to know about the modifications?—

23256. Mr. KAVANAGH.—What is the grievance now against the rule with a footnote?—The grievance is that in a school where it would be endorsed, the teacher would be deprived of the opportunity of promotion. The footnote guarantees a man against a depression of salary, but then it makes no provision for promotion.

Mr. COFFEY.—In fact the lowering of his numbers debar him from promotion?—

23257. Mr. HENRY.—Not only that, but there is a loss of capitation?—The loss of capitation and the loss of promotion.

23258. What number of schools does that affect?—There is no return that would show that, but we get up to 360 cases that were injuriously affected for this inquiry.

23259. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Would there not be very few cases of adjacent schools with a mistress to which boys could be sent?—No. There are many cases of double schools, the mistress teaching in the school opposite to the master or upstairs or downstairs in the same building, as the case may be.

23260. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—Would it be any advantage to the mistress to have these children sent to her?—Yes, her average would go up and she would be eligible for promotion to a higher grade.

23261. The CHAIRMAN.—She would get a chance she never expected very often?—Yes.

23262. Mr. COFFEY.—But the point is, altogether apart from any hardship, the teachers never were consulted and no regard was paid to the interests of the men in the service when this was promulgated?—It was simply a violation of vested rights.

23263. And Dr. Starke refused to hear the teachers?—Yes; on the 19th March, 1905, a deputation waited on Dr. Starke, and he told them emphatically that the rule would never be withdrawn or altered, and that it was useless for them to dash themselves against a stone wall, and advised them in private conversation with the managers to advocate amalgamation.

23264. Then the Rev. Dr. Foley proposed a resolution at the Board?—Yes. He proposed—"That any school upon which the effect of 127 (b) would be to reduce the salary of an existing teacher should be exempt from the operations of that rule during such teacher's term of office." That would secure from loss all existing teachers while in their present school.

23265. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—You say it was ascertained through Parliament. Was that in answer to a question or was it by a White Paper?—In answer to a question the voting was given.

23266. The CHAIRMAN.—Now I think we may go on to the agitation over 127 (b)?—Yes. The teachers were distracted from their duties, and in a national state of panic; those affected because of the degradation and loss staring them in the face, those not affected because they might wake up any day to find their rights invaded by some new rule sprung on them through the advertising columns of the newspaper. Indignation meetings were held all over the country, at which all the representative men of the nation, from Cardinal Logue downward, denounced the Board and counselled resistance to its edicts. In June, 1905, the entire Hierarchy, assembled in Maynooth, passed a resolution, advising all the managers of the National schools to unite in refusing to put in force the new amalgamating rules. With regard to the attitude of the Hierarchy and managers over 127 (b), they passed a resolution in June, 1905, demanding the reform of the Board of Education which we have been demanding ever since, and they passed a very important resolution showing the state of education at the time in the following words:—"That we have observed with regret that since the advent to office of the present Resident Commissioner, the proceedings of the Board of National Education have been, for the most part, an unbroken record of mischievous changes and innovations. New revolutionary educational schemes have been from time to time hastily adopted, and as hastily cast aside; and rules have

been framed, modified and abolished with bewildering frequency, until the entire system of Primary Education has been reduced to a state of deplorable confusion. Teachers have been brought under a new system of classification, involving in many cases professional degradation and pecuniary loss, while the natural rights of parents and the views of managers regarding the education of the children have been contemptuously ignored. We believe, therefore, that the first step towards the reform of the Educational Board ought to be the removal of the present Resident Commissioner from an office which he has not filled for the benefit of Irish Primary Education, and in which he has forfeited the confidence of the majority of Irish managers."

23276. What was the body that passed that?—The Central Council of the Catholic Clerical Managers' Association.

23277. That is for all Ireland?—Yes.

23278. Now we come to the reference in the Board's report to 127 (b)?—The teachers asserted that Mr. Dale's recommendation of this rule originated in a cheese-paring policy of the Treasury to cut down educational expenditure. This was officially denied by the Board in their report in 1905. And in reply to the complaint that it would lower the incomes of principals of boys' schools, both as regards grade salary and capitation, the report admits very callosely that "It is true that the strict application of the rule might be to lower the incomes of the principals of small boys' schools, by preventing their promotion in grade, and by reducing their capitation grant," but adds the remedy is obvious, viz., amalgamation, as if that were any redress for teachers who had no power to enforce amalgamation. The violence of this storm gradually spent itself in time, but the wound has rankled up to the present day.

23279. When schools are amalgamated what becomes of the second teacher?—When schools become amalgamated the man becomes the principal and the woman the assistant.

Mr. HENRY.—And she becomes for the time being a privileged assistant holding the salary she held before.

23280. Sir HERAM WILKINSON.—May I ask with regard to this rule without reference to its operation on the teachers, what are the views of public bodies with regard to it, and what are the views of the teachers from the educational point of view?—You see that didn't enter into our agitation. The agitation was on account of the violation of vested rights. Personally I could give you my opinion. I know if I had little boys to send to school I would send them to a woman, in preference to a man while they were small boys, but when they got big I would prefer a man teacher for them.

23281. The CHAIRMAN.—We would like to know what biggest means? At what age would you send them to a man teacher?—My own school is a mixed school. When I get the school the manager said a mistress will be able to teach the little boys until they get up to 12 or 13; when they could go into Barr to the Christian Brothers' or some other boys' school.

23282. You would keep the boys until 12?—Yes.

23283. Mr. HENRY.—If there was a boys' and girls' school side by side would you keep them until 12?—You mean under 127 (b). I am talking now about a mixed school.

Mr. CONRY.—I thought you were asked your opinion from an educational point of view.

23284. The CHAIRMAN.—Are little boys better under a woman than a man?—Mr. Dale said they were, and all opinion leads to that side. Mr. Dale said in his report that it was recognised by educationalists now, that young boys were better under a woman?—They are better mothered under a woman and they are better looked after by little girls, sisters and companions, while they are wee boys.

23285. Mr. HENRY.—Supposing you have two schools side by side, the wee boys with the mistress, and the bigger boys with the master, when do you think the wee boys should be removed from the girls' to the boys' school?—I think I would remove them when they are able to look after themselves; when they are no longer infants, that would be for the sake of the master.

23286. You see not asked for the sake of the master, but for the sake of the boys?—That would be a very hard question for me to answer. I am teaching boys and you would not want me to give an opinion about myself.

23287. You have a mixed school with young boys, and therefore my question does not at all refer to you. I was supposing you had two schools side by side, one under a mistress with the wee boys and the other under a master; these boys must be at some time transferred from the girls' to the boys' school. At what age do you think, from your own experience as a teacher, would it be in the interests of the boys, not mixing that of the teacher to transfer them?—You cannot separate the personal equation from that question in my case.

23288. You can. It does not affect yourself at all, we are not referring to your school, would you keep the boys up to 12?—Oh, they do not stay.

23289. Would you remove them at some time?—I would.

23290. About what age, at what time would boys in the natural course of things be more or less difficult to be dealt with and disciplined by a woman teacher?—It depends a great deal upon the teacher. I could keep my boys until they became men and I would not have the slightest trouble in teaching them, or enforcing discipline; suppose I say to you here that in such cases boys might be removed to the master at six, the uneducated reading that would think the boys were wasting time with women teachers, which is not the case.

23291. Sir HERAM WILKINSON.—My question was rather to find out whether there had been any corporate expression on the part of the teachers, or any views expressed with regard to the matter from the educational point of view. The teachers do not seem to have had occasion to express their views with regard to that point?—They have not expressed any opinion upon the merits of the rule at all, they have protested against the rule as an injurious rule to education, because of its injurious effects on the teachers and on the schools.

The CHAIRMAN.—As Miss Mahon cannot produce any resolution I think we ought not to press her.

Mr. HENRY.—Suppose you have three schools side by side, infants, boys, and girls, what would be the proper age to transfer the infant boys to the boys' school and the infant girls to the girls' school?

The CHAIRMAN.—She has given her personal reasons for not answering, and I think we ought not to press her further.

23292. Sir HERAM WILKINSON.—Do you know whether any public body has expressed an opinion on the point?—The public body that has expressed an opinion is the Council of the Managers' Association, and they expressed an opinion in favour of keeping the boys with the masters from the beginning. I can answer that quite easily, practically the whole volume of opinion in this country is in favour of having the boys with the masters even from infancy.

23293. You say in this country. Are you quite sure that that is the opinion all over the country?—I am judging by the resolutions at public meetings protesting against rule 127 (b) in 1903.

23294. Where were they held?—All over the country, north, south, east, west, and centre, the whole of Ireland was affected.

23295. These were resolutions of teachers?—There were resolutions of public meetings in favour of teachers and protesting against 127 (b).

23296. Mr. CONRY.—Of course, these resolutions were drafted having in view the injury that was done to the male teacher. They didn't consider it from the point of view of education at all?—Well, they professed to consider it from the point of view of education.

23297. The CHAIRMAN.—Miss Mahon does not want to pursue that question, and I think we can go on to her next point, which deals with Dr. Scallie's refusal to receive a deputation in June, 1906?—Yes; the Resident Commissioner was asked for an interview, and he refused the interview in view of certain things that occurred at a teachers' banquet at Sligo. I should like to say what happened at the Sligo banquet. At that banquet given by the Congress some of the guests objected to drink the health of the King.

23298. Mr. COFFEY.—Some of the local people invited—Some of the invited guests. It was the custom at that time to invite guests from the district in which the congress was held to the banquet.

23299. The CHAIRMAN.—We understand that some of these people from outside refused to drink the King's health?—It was not proved that any teacher participated in it.

23300. That was my point?—Even if it was, it would not be surprising if some of them did because at the Sligo Congress the teachers were in a state of great agitation over the recent promulgation of 187 (b) and were loud and bitter in their resentment to the Board. In that frame of mind the King might get brushed with a wave of the hurricane raging all that week, not, indeed, on account of his personality or his sovereignty, but as the head of such an institution as the National Board. The Board, without any direct evidence expressly incriminating any of the teachers, published the following flaming circular* in the newspapers, and Dr. Starke, in the superabundant excess of his loyalty to the Crown and Constitution, again banged the door in the teachers' faces. But the teachers believed that the real reason for denying them admittance was because of their violent agitation over 187 (b), the disloyalty of a few invited guests at the Sligo banquet being only a convenient excuse, occurring opportunely at the time, because there is reason to suppose that a Board that discovers the King's deputies—the Viceroy and Chief Secretary—would discover the King himself far sooner than the teachers would.

23301. I wonder if the King would recognise himself as head of the National Board?—They published the following flaming circular to the teachers of the National schools, but as that circular will appear in the Appendix I do not think it necessary to read it.

23302. The main point is that the Commissioners say in that circular, "They regret to observe a growing spirit of insubordination on the part of many teachers, and a disregard of the rules."—Yes.

23303. Mr. COFFEY.—Was there any evidence that there was a growing spirit of insubordination?—I did not know of any such evidence or of evidence proving that they participated in the disloyalty that called forth this circular.

23304. Mr. HENRY.—I would like you to look at one paragraph of this circular. "Teachers would do well to avoid meetings, etc. Failure to do so in future will render the teacher liable to serious penalty." Now in the circular issued in 1884 it stated in the concluding sentences the Commissioners have resolved that the presence of the teacher at such meetings would render him responsible for all the things said or done by any of those present, unless he at once publicly disavowed anything said or done of an objectionable character, and this public disavowal was to be followed by an open withdrawal from the meeting. We were assured by Dr. Starke that that was dead, but was not the worst of it embodied in this circular?—Yes, and that circular was never submitted to the Commissioners, yet it contains the very worst features of the circular of 1884, which we were assured was dead and buried.

23305. The CHAIRMAN.—The Belfast teachers passed a resolution in reference to that circular?—Yes, on the 12th July, 1906, they passed the following resolution:—"That with reference to the circular issued in the name of the Commissioners of National Education, and referring to the incidents alleged at the Sligo Congress, we hereby emphatically declare—1st, That the manner of its publication is needlessly and provokingly offensive to those to whom it is addressed; 2nd, that a rule or regulation which conveys insult and imposes restrictions upon those against whom no shadow of blame or reasonable suspicion can be sustained looks like incapacity of administration, tends to destroy confidence, and if persisted in must weaken the ties of sympathy, which are the best guarantee of wholesome respect for constituted authority; 3rd, that it is contrary to the spirit and genius of British law to condemn without a hearing, or to make no discrimination between

those who may have offended and those who never would dream of doing as alleged in the circular; 4th, that the indefinite terms of the circular sweep away the dearest rights of citizenship from an educated and intelligent body of public servants, and we call upon the Commissioners to define accurately what is meant by 'controversy,' 'meetings,' etc., as hitherto law or rule capable of obduracy must be explicit." That summarizes our feeling with regard to that circular.

23307. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—You say this circular was published in the newspapers. Do you know if it was published by order of the Board or not?—I remember distinctly it was officially published in the newspapers.

23308. You were quite satisfied about that?—I am perfectly certain of that.

23309. The CHAIRMAN.—Then comes the resolution of the Central Executive which says that Dr. Starke refuses the interview ostensibly owing to what happened at the Sligo banquet, but really because of your opposition to 127 (b)?—This is the resolution:—"That as the Central Secretary has submitted to this Committee 107 cases of teachers who have been deprived of the increments, etc., to which they consider they were justly entitled, and as this Committee authorized the Secretary to bring these cases under the notice of the Resident Commissioner, and that a deputation was appointed from this Committee to wait on him in reference to these cases of alleged injustice, and that as replies have been received from the Resident Commissioner in the early part of this year and at intervals since that time refusing to entertain cases represented by this Committee on the grounds that they should have been presented by the ordinary course, through the respective managers of the teachers concerned, we are surprised to find that the Resident Commissioner now refuses to receive the deputation on the grounds that the Committee did not repudiate the action of those who are alleged to have taken part in 'Objectionable Proceedings' at the Congress Dinner, and for which this Committee is in no way responsible." The Circular recently issued by the Board was next considered, and the following resolution in reference to it was adopted:—"That we are extremely surprised at the condemnatory tone of the Circular dated 20th June, 1905, to the National teachers from the Education Office, especially (1) as it has not been proved that any teacher acted disloyally or disrespectfully to the King at the Sligo Congress Banquet; (2) that as regards others, the teachers, no matter how they might differ from them, had no control over, and therefore no responsibility for, their actions; and that we deem it unjust to condemn the leaders of the Organisation for not reviewing the proceedings of the Sligo Congress, and for not pronouncing judgment on alleged acts which, even if proved, the Congress alone had power to deal with, and therefore we respectfully request the withdrawal of the Circular." Then there was a letter from a Minister in Sligo in which he says that the whole blame rested upon persons who were guests at the dinner.

23310. Mr. COFFEY.—Was that circular ever withdrawn?—It was never officially withdrawn.

23311. You never got an intimation that it was withdrawn?—No.

23312. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—I think it is quite clear you draw a distinction between the Sligo Congress and your Organisation. Would you explain that distinction?—The Central Executive Committee consists of elected representatives of the Organisation from other parts of Ireland, it is a Committee of 16 members. The Congress is the meeting of the delegates of the Association from every part of Ireland.

23313. The CHAIRMAN.—It meets at a different place every year?—Yes, and at each Congress every branch association, according to its numerical strength, sends one or two or more delegates to the Congress. The Central Committee consists of representatives each elected by a number of different associations, grouped together in one district.

* Vide Appendix LII.

16th September, 1913.]

Miss C. M. MAHON examined.

[Continued.]

23314. That Congress meets sometimes in Dublin, sometimes in Belfast, sometimes in Cork, sometimes in Derry?—Yes, in all the leading cities and great towns. The Congress has supreme power and the Central Executive Committee is a body elected annually which takes its instructions from each Congress.

Sir HERALD WILKINSON.—Perhaps I have been mistaken. I thought the tenor of your answer was to disclaim on the part of the Executive any responsibility for what the Congress had done.

23315. The CHAIRMAN.—They said they were not responsible for the invited guests?—The Central Executive Committee could not repudiate officially anything that happened at the Congress until another Congress empowered them to do so.

Sir HERALD WILKINSON.—It seems to me after the explanation of Miss Mahon that the Central Executive Committee does represent Congress.

Mr. HENRY.—In the absence of Congress.

23316. Sir HERALD WILKINSON.—But there would be no inconsistency in speaking of the Executive Committee as the Executive Committee of Congress. Saying that they had not responsibility for what Congress did seems to imply that Congress was quite a distinct body from your Organisation, and I wanted to see really if that was so?—The Central Executive Committee takes its mandate for the year from Congress. On the 2nd September, 1905, the Executive tried again to get a hearing from the whole Board, but were again informed that it was not the practice of the Commissioners to receive deputations.

23317. The CHAIRMAN.—You have something to say about the Board's attitude in regard to salaries?—Yes. In the 1905 Report of the Commissioners twenty paragraphs are devoted to the attempt to prove that Irish teachers were better paid than the English and Scotch, especially in small schools, and for this purpose they took the poorest spots in Great Britain, such as the Isle of Lewis where there are only seven schools under 50 average, and then from certain premises they triumphantly announce that "for this class of school the salaries are much higher in Ireland than in Lewis" as if a normal district in Ireland was on a parallel with the isolated little islet of Lewis. This laboured attempt to prove that the teachers had no grounds for complaint in regards salaries in 1905, under the Government of Messrs. Balfour and Wyndham, forms a very curious and inapplicable contrast to the Home Rule Manifesto of August, 1912, in the days of Messrs. Asquith and Birrell, admitting, what the teachers always contended, that half a million more is needed to put Irish education on a financial equality with Great Britain.

23318. What do you refer to when you talk of the Home Rule Manifesto of 1912?—That is the manifesto the Commissioners published in 1912 containing extracts from their own report which the Executive Government would not sanction.

23319. That was with regard to additional finances in the Home Rule Bill?—Yes.

23320. Sir HERALD WILKINSON.—You could hardly call that a Home Rule Manifesto?—It was known as that popularly.

The CHAIRMAN.—The ordinary reader won't know what that means.

Mr. HENRY.—Call it the manifesto against the educational finance of the Home Rule Bill.

23321. Sir HERALD WILKINSON.—Or the manifesto of the Board referring to the finances of the Home Rule Bill?—I am quite satisfied.

23322. The CHAIRMAN.—There was a protest against refusal of access to the Board at a Waterford Congress?—Yes. In 1906 the teachers again protested against being shut out from the Board. I am proving by his evidence that the teachers had tried to gain access to the Board all along, and they protested against being shut out time after time. It was Mr. Thompson of Belfast who wrote this report.* It has a Central Executive Committee Report to Congress. The teachers at the Waterford Congress made a strong protest against Dr. Sturkie's continued refusal to give them access to the Board.

23323. During this year an additional source of discontent was the increase in the number of dis-

missals?—Yes. Dr. Traill, who was a member of the Board since 1891, in an address delivered at the Marlboro' Street Training College on the 10th June, 1906, denounced the dismissals and condemned the degradation of the teachers under the new system of grading, and said that he feared that such a system was bound to fall on the lines on which it had been introduced. He contends that, if introduced at all, it should commence in the training colleges. We never heard of the Provost's prophecy as to the failure of the paper system, but we are in thorough accord with him when he says it should commence, if introduced at all, in the training colleges. The Provost tells us:—"I fear that one result of this mistake has been that teachers who had excellent records as teachers for years under the old system have been pronounced inefficient under the new system and dismissed with or without proper pension, and their schools closed or amalgamated as a result of that enforced inefficiency." Another matter dwelt upon by the Provost was the injustice of the grading system. "A teacher who has been classed first of first may now be called third grade because the number of his pupils happens to be small, so that he becomes 'degraded' before the public, who do not understand this change of nomenclature. He or she should be ranked according to their ability as teachers and their learning, and not by the accident that they cannot get large schools. Under the present nomenclature the great bulk of teachers must be third grade." These utterances of a Commissioner increased the alarm, and a return* obtained in Parliament by Mr. T. O'Donnell, M.P., still more accentuated the agitation.

23324. Sir HERALD WILKINSON.—Was that a White Paper?—No, it was a question in Parliament.

23325. The CHAIRMAN.—The information was obtained by Mr. Thomas O'Donnell, M.P.?—Yes, and the following paragraph from a letter by the then Secretary of the Organisation shows the state of feeling at the time:—"Through this order was harsh and threatening it had one commendable feature—it systematised the procedure against a teacher alleged to be inefficient, and, apparently at least, gave him a chance of retrieving his character. The circumstances of the school might make it impossible for the accused teacher to order matters so that the Inspector who previously censured him should report 'the proficiency materially improved,' and if not:—then! It was some advantage, however, to have a warning and three annual trials before the charge of inefficiency and the supreme penalty of dismissal; but it seems the advantage no longer avail, and that the Board's Order of 1909, though never formally withdrawn, is ignored, so far as it is in any degree favourable. I am informed that teachers are now being dismissed, with the brand of inefficiency, after only one bad report, and are denied the slight possible benefit of even that special regulation of the Board, which is formally and essentially a penal statement. Is the teacher who is charged with inefficiency an outcast? If not, he is entitled in mere justice to be dealt with according to the strict letter of that law of the Board, which prescribes censure, and depression, or fine, for four years in succession, or the forerunners of ultimate dismissal. I think, too, it will be generally granted that the Teachers' Executive are fully justified in demanding an impartial investigation of every case involving consequences so serious as the dismissal in ignominy of an old, and possibly very capable, teacher."

23326. You know the account the Board gave of these dismissals in 1904-5 in the report of 1905-6?—Yes; I have seen that. They attempted to justify these dismissals for inefficiency.

23327. Mr. HENRY.—You are aware that the schools were classified as "excellent" and "very good," and so on, before the new system?—There were no standards for classification before.

23328. They were returned in the reports for 1903 and 1902?—Do you mean the schools of those teachers dismissed?

23329. No. I am talking of the schools as a whole, and they were classified as "excellent" and "very good"?—Yes.

* Vide Appendix LII.

And for the years 1903, 1904, 1905, the Board published no statistics with regard to the schools. When Mr. Dilworth was under examination I asked him why he didn't furnish any returns for 1903, 1904, 1905.

THE CHAIRMAN.—Belongs about what?

23330. Mr. HENRY.—About the schools as to how classified. And then we got classification of the schools beginning again in 1906. Have you ever heard any explanation why it was that the Board issued no tabulation of their schools during those years 1903, 1904 and 1905?—I have not enquired, but, of course, we had very little opportunity of getting information.

23331. The CHAIRMAN.—The peculiar thing is this, that everything seemed to be working comparatively smoothly under the new system until 1903 and 1904; then a change came over the administration, and it was during that time that they gave no information with regard to the classification of schools that the dismissals were up to 100 per cent.—In the 1905 Report the Board says, first, to justify the dismissals; secondly, to cast the odium of them on the managers; thirdly, to seek to justify the over-riding of the scale of penalties, which gave the teacher three chances, by explaining "that when the system of class salaries was abolished the terms did not apply any longer, but stated that the dismissals did not take place till the cases were personally examined by the Resident Commissioner, thereby proclaiming Dr. Starke as Director-in-Chief of the Department. The Report scouted the idea of any appeal from the Board.

23332. Have you got the words before you where they repeated that idea?—Yes. The teachers drew up a reply, from which the following are some extracts:—

"The Report quotes the scale of penalties sanctioned by the Board's Order of 2nd May, 1909, and says it naturally fell into disuse with the abolition of the old system. It is surely as easy under the present system to reduce a teacher's salary as it was under the old. Grade salary can be as easily reduced as class salary, and there can be quite as easily inflicted under the one system as the other, but it is evident a more expeditious mode of dispatch was desired, and hence the new mode of procedure. Certainly the Commissioners cannot now reproach themselves with 'too much leniency' when teachers of many years' experience are being cast on the mercy of the world at the rate of 50 per centum.

"The Report says:—'In nearly all cases the dismissal was not ordered till the Senior Inspector had added his opinion to that of the District Inspector.' This implies that some teachers were dismissed on the report of one inspector. The high official who was entrusted with the consideration of the case at headquarters apparently considered only the inspectors' reports; the Resident Commissioner evidently only did the same. What can be the feelings of officials who, on an average for the past three years, have condemned one teacher each week to a life of poverty, misery, and degradation?

"Another singular circumstance is that only in Ireland are dismissals for inefficiency known. Since 1859 only one teacher in Scotland had his certificate withdrawn by the Department, and there was no such case in England, while almost 250 were dismissed in Ireland."

23333. Mr. HANNAH.—I venture to suggest that that may be a risky statement to make, because I believe that dismissals might be made by the local authorities in England. I mean that if an Imperial Inspector pronounces a teacher absolutely inefficient he will get a year's grace; but the Education Committee of the London County Council could dismiss a man though there would be no dismissal by the Central Authority?—Yes.

23334. Then you see it is rather misleading, I think?—That statement was made publicly in 1906, and it has never been contradicted.

I think you will find my suggestion is correct.

23335. Mr. HENRY.—Miss Mahon is putting it in as a statement by the Central Executive at the time, and it has never been contradicted since?—The statement continues: "Inefficiency might be found nearer the

educational centre of Ireland than where the dismissals have taken place. When 25 per cent. of teachers were still without increments nine months after they had been earned, there was evidence of inefficiency at headquarters which should have made officials slower to dismiss those in their power."

Mr. HENRY.—There would be dismissals for inefficiency by the managers corresponding to the dismissals by the local authority in England.

23336. The CHAIRMAN.—You refer to a resolution about specimen time-tables and a resolution about want of uniformity?—Yes, showing that the want of uniformity was felt as far back as 1906.

23337. Then there was Mr. Birrell's promise in 1907?—That was an important year for the teachers.

23338. He promised a grant for increasing salaries and providing scholarships?—Yes. He promised that, having taken up the cause of education, he would never lay it down, and hoped to come to them before long, not only with sympathetic words, but with full hands. On the 27th April of that year Dr. Starke promised, through the intervention of Mr. Murphy, M.P., newly elected Parliamentary Secretary to the teachers, that he would open the door again to the teachers' deputation, but another incident set the teachers up against him afresh.

23339. Sir HUBERT WINDING.—What is a Parliamentary Secretary?—In 1907 we tried the experiment of having a Parliamentary Secretary, that is a Member of Parliament Secretary to the teachers, to look after their interests in Parliament. We kept him for a couple of years, but found the experiment was not a success.

23340. The CHAIRMAN.—Is Mr. O'Donnell your Secretary now?—No; we ask Members of Parliament generally to look after our interests.

23341. Mr. O'Donnell acts as a permanent official almost?—He was formerly a teacher, and has a great interest in education.

23342. You have something to say about Dr. Starke's speech at the Federal Conference in 1907?—Yes. On Empire Day, 1907, at the Federal Conference of Education in London, attended, like the British Association, by educationists from the ends of the earth, the London Times reported him as having addressed his audience both at the Banquet and the Conference by ridiculing the Irish managers, the Irish teachers, and the Irish National school pupils.

23343. You say he ridiculed the Irish managers. Have you got that part of his speech?—He said the Irish schools were managed by Irish managers, he would not call them authorities, they had an objection to the word, they were managed by individuals, and it depended entirely upon the individuals whether the teachers would be allowed to go or not—he was referring there to the interchange of teachers. He said he knew many of the managers would be delighted if they went, and in some cases would give them an exceedingly good testimonial, but he was not quite certain that they would be willing to take them back at the end of the year.

23344. Mr. CONNELL.—He implies the managers would give them an exceedingly good testimonial to get rid of them, but expresses his doubt as to their willingness to take them back again?—Yes.

23345. At all events, the Teachers' Executive thought he had made offensive remarks regarding the teachers and the managers?—Yes, the speech was reported very fully in the London Times, and was quoted in the *Freeman's Journal*, but unless I read the whole of it you would not understand its significance. I cannot at the moment pick out extracts.

23346. The CHAIRMAN.—The teachers repudiated his statement in a resolution, and I think you might give the substance of it?—They expressed very emphatic condemnation of his language, and of the effects he made to damage them in the eyes of the public, and they named Dr. Starke that they were not as indifferent to their civil rights as he seemed to think.

23347. Then the Catholic managers passed a resolution calling for the removal of Dr. Starke?—Yes, they passed this resolution:—

"That we have learned with surprise that Mr. Bryce, the late Chief Secretary, told the House of

COMMONS in August last that the continuance in office of the present Resident Commissioner was not objected to by the Catholic managers of Ireland. That we direct our secretaries to draw the attention of Mr. Birrell to the resolution we had unanimously adopted at our previous meeting on June 26th, and which had been duly forwarded to Mr. Bryce."

The following is the resolution referred to above:—

"That, as a new Government has recently come into office, our secretary be directed to bring under the notice of Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland the profound and widespread dissatisfaction that exists amongst the Catholic clerical school managers of the continuance in office of Dr. Sturkle, Resident Commissioner, who unaccountably stammered us in a public address delivered in Belfast in 1903, and by the aid of garbled and distorted official documents not then, nor for months after, available to the public. In that address he sneered at our exertions to erect and adorn our churches, and almost avowed his desire to deprive us of our position and powers as school managers. His conduct, unrepented of, makes impossible the existence of such good-will and cordial feeling as the interests of education require, between the virtual head of the Education Department and the managers of the vast majority of the schools of Ireland."

23048. Then you next refer to the memorial from the transition teachers?—During this year the Executive made another attempt to gain redress for the transition teachers. In the 1904 report the Commissioners published a table showing the average incomes for schools of 25 and 70, respectively, under the old system. Basing their calculations on this table, 70 transition teachers sent in an estimate of their losses under the new system. The Executive drew up a memorial and presented it to the Chief Secretary and the Commissioners, but without result. We also got counsel's opinion as to whether the arrears could be recovered, but our counsel invariably informs us that the law of the land affords us no protection from the rules of the National Board. One of these transition teachers got special redress, but he had exactly the same case as upwards of a dozen others denied redress, and a question was asked in Parliament as to the grounds on which he got special redress as compared with the others, and this is the reply:—"Sir,—In reference to your communication received on the 14th inst., I am directed by the Commissioners of National Education to inform you that they cannot enter into a discussion of the reasons as to why the teacher referred to in your letter was accorded special treatment." They refused to state the ground on which they gave special consideration to a transitional teacher and left others equally deserving without consideration. Now I come to re-inspection. The Central Executive passed a resolution this year (1907), dealing with various complaints of dissatisfaction at present prevailing throughout Ireland in reference to the present practice of the Board in refusing a re-inspection in many cases where it is alleged teachers have been unjustly treated by the report or verdict of an inspector, causing the non-allocation of increments or promotion, say, even leading up to deprivation or dismissal. We believe that referring to the old custom of granting a right of appeal in all such cases would have such a moderating effect on the demeanour of inspectors generally as to reduce the number of such complaints and grievances to a minimum; and we demand that in all cases where the two previous reports of a teacher were up to the standard required to obtain promotion, no teacher should be disallowed such promotion in consequence of a less favourable report by any inspector on his first visit to a school, as on such occasions it is well known many inspectors are over-exacting. We made an attempt to get the matter exposed by a Parliamentary question, but the information was refused.

23049. Mr. CORRY.—That is really a matter of having any right of appeal?—Yes. Mr. Murphy asked the Chief Secretary whether National School teachers are allowed by the Commissioners of National Education to appeal against an inspection, and if he can state how many applications for re-inspection were

received during the past year, and how many re-inspections were ordered by the Commissioners. That was on the 6th May, 1907. Mr. Birrell replied:—"The Commissioners of National Education inform me that under their regulations any teacher who feels aggrieved by the conduct of the inspector can appeal through the manager to the Commissioners. When such an appeal is made the Commissioners carefully consider all the circumstances of the case, and if they deem it necessary they instruct one of the senior or chief inspectors to visit the school and to make a special report. The Commissioners are unable to say how many applications for re-inspection were received from teachers during the past year. In order to do so a close scrutiny of all the letters received from teachers would be necessary. The Commissioners, however, are prepared to report upon any specific case which the hon. member may have in view." So that all information was refused even through Parliament.

23050. In view of the evidence we have now had, do you think Parliament was correctly informed as to these cases of appeal?—No.

23051. Were cases carefully considered by the Commissioners?—It is very doubtful if they got any consideration at all, but at any rate, whatever consideration they got, led in the majority of cases to the refusal of the appeal.

23052. The CHAIRMAN.—Do you think that the word "Commissioners" there is used, as Dr. Sturkle tells us it is used, just as the expression "Loans of the Treasury" is used, and represents himself or some other officer?

Mr. CORRY.—It is reasonable enough in the usual routine letters of the Board.

The CHAIRMAN.—Don't you think it is used there in that sense?

Mr. CORRY.—It is a question whether it is justifiably so used?

23053. The CHAIRMAN.—Have the Commissioners ever considered the circumstances of these cases, and have they ever instructed a senior or chief inspector to visit the schools?—Never.

23053a. Therefore I say the word "Commissioners" is used in that sense that was explained to us. It means the persons acting in the name of the Commissioners. Now come on to 1908?—This year was characterized by another row with the Commissioners, this time over the allocation of the Birrell Grant. On the 7th December, 1907, the Teachers' Executive met, and drew up a scheme for the allocation of the prospective grant. You may remember Mr. Birrell promised this when attending our Congress in 1907, and it was included in the estimates for the following year, and consequently we drew up a statement* of our views as to the distribution of the grant.

23054. The CHAIRMAN.—Will you give us an idea of that?—We desired that the grant should be used to provide increments; that the increments should be substantially increased, and should be annual, and should provide a sufficient stim to enable the present unjust barriers to promotion to be removed. A deputation in support of this waited on Dr. Sturkle on the 14th December, 1907. Dr. Sturkle told them that the Board had already decided that the grant was to be distributed in septennial, as the Treasury preferred a rough and ready scheme that would not involve much trouble. The teachers condemned this method of allocation as unduly favouring large schools. In the end of June, 1908, the Board's proposed method of allocation became public through Parliament, and in the words of a letter I wrote, July 4th, 1908, "No words can describe the paralysis which seized the teachers of Ireland when they learned that the 3,907 teachers of schools under 25 were to be excluded from any participation in the increased grant." The estimate was withdrawn and sent back to the Commissioners for amendment. It was withdrawn on the representation of members of Parliament interested in our case. In the meantime the Teachers' Executive adopted a resolution asking the grant to be distributed in the form of an equal increase to the salaries of all the teachers in the service."

* Vide Appendix IAI

33355. The Commission.—And that is the form it did take?—Practically.

33356. A grant of £7 a year?—A grant of £7 for third class, £8 for second class, and £10 for first. It was as nearly as possible an equal distribution.

33357. The Grant would be by equal increments to the salaries of the teachers irrespective of average or grade?—First the Treasury wanted a simple method of distribution, and was therefore requested the Irish Members of Parliament to try and have the Grant distributed by an equal increase to the salaries of all teachers pending a proper adjustment of salaries of all teachers in the service. A deputation proceeded to London to interview Mr. Birrell in support of this resolution. They saw him on Wednesday, July 23rd, and pointed out to him that an agitation for an increase in initial salaries had been going on for years, and in response to this agitation he promised the Grant at the Teachers' Congress to increase initial salaries and salaries of poorly paid teachers, but these would be excluded by the scheme of the Commission and that as the Grant was so small and the Treasury wanted a simple scheme, the equal dividend method would approach not indeed justice but the least injustice to the most needy. He promised them that the revision of the estimate would follow mainly in accordance with the views put before him by the teachers. The second proposal of the Commission was then dropped, and two days after the reception of the deputation Mr. Birrell brought in the revised estimate himself which gave satisfaction, and the Grant was paid with the October salaries for the year 1908. During the time that the method of allocation was in dispute the small school teachers and the assistants were in a state of great unrest, and the Press was full of letters protesting against their proposed exclusion. In the 1908 report the Commission state: "After considerable correspondence we succeeded in securing a Grant of £114,500." And then after referring to the rejection of their first and second proposals for its distribution they continue:—We think it to be our duty to protest most strongly against the abandonment by the Government, without consultation with us, of this essential part of our scheme in favour of an addition to the increase of salaries in the third and second of first grade, which, on account of its insignificance, will be productive of little effect. We consider this action on the part of the Government to be an infringement, unparalleled in our history, of the spirit of the original constitution on which the Board was founded, viz., that it should be entrusted with absolute control over the funds which might be annually voted by Parliament.

33358-9. Then you paid tribute to the teachers for their unselfishness during that agitation?—Yes, and Mr. Birrell paid a tribute* to them in the House of Commons.

33360. Then we came to the agreement forms for teachers?—At a deputation in December, 1907, Dr. Starke discussed the agreement forms. In consequence of his observations the Catholic teachers at Killybegs Congress held a private meeting and decided to stand by Form I. and II. Acting out of this deputation the Connacht managers passed the following resolution in May, 1908, calling for Dr. Starke's removal, and to my knowledge they have never changed from that attitude. I have the report of the deputation here and I will hand it in. This is the resolution of the Connacht managers. It was proposed by Fr. McLoughlin, seconded by Fr. O'Hara:—"That this meeting expresses its satisfaction at the action of the Catholic teachers attending the recent Congress at Killybegs in unanimously approving of No. 3 Form of Agreement between Managers and Teachers. This unanimous approval of the Catholic Teachers is all the more valuable, in the opinion of the Managers, as it is in striking opposition to the mischievous advice given by Mr. Starke to the teachers' deputation that waited on him on 14th December last, when he urged them, in their private conference, to insist on the withdrawal of Forms Nos. 1 and 2, and to call at once on the Commissioners to make the new Forms Nos. 3 and 4 compulsory. Mr. Starke's presence in the Education Office is a menace and a danger to Catholic faith. We shall never

cease, as long as he remains there, to call for his removal." I now come to the year 1909. During this year occurred an incident which resulted in the banning of the teachers' representatives by Dr. Starke once again. On the 6th February, 1909, I went on my first and last deputation to Dr. Starke. I took notes of the proceedings during the progress of the interview. When we returned from the Education Office we made a verbal report to a sub-committee that was engaged that day drafting the Congress Programme. At the next full meeting of the Teachers' Executive, February 27th, my report of the deputation was ordered to be printed and circulated to the secretaries of the associations, marked private and confidential.

33361. May I ask you was that mark, "private and confidential," put upon that paper, in compliance with the request of Dr. Starke?—It was inadvertently omitted at first.

33362. I know, but did Dr. Starke request you to mark it private and confidential?—It was understood always that these deputations were private and confidential.

33363. But did he lay stress upon it at that meeting?—He laid stress upon certain points that were very confidential that would necessitate having the whole report marked "private and confidential." A report of the interview with Dr. Starke was sent forward by the secretary of the deputation to Mr. John Murphy, M.P., who could not conveniently attend this meeting. A fuller report presented by me, amended in a few respects by Mr. Gamble and Mr. O'Callaghan, who were also members of the deputation, was submitted and approved. The Central Secretary was to send copies confidentially to Secretaries of Associations immediately on receiving the amended draft. When Dr. Clarke had it ready he sent it down to me to look through it and to send it on direct to the printers. I did so, and it was only when I got some copies in print that I noticed the omission of the private and confidential mark. I wrote immediately to Dr. Clarke drawing his attention to the omission. Dr. Clarke marked all the copies in his possession private and confidential in red ink and despatched post-cards in red ink to the secretaries asking them to do likewise. I also put a note in the Irish School Weekly to the same effect. That should have been ample atonement for an inadvertent omission. In that report it is mentioned that Dr. Starke said the managers were against civil rights for teachers, and that they had strong representation on the Board. The contents of this report were circulated by the secretaries to all the teachers, and Father Curry, P.P., heard about the accusation against the managers and contradicted it, as far as the Catholic managers were concerned in the *Freeman* of April 12, 1909. Dr. Starke took no notice of this contradiction and made no move whatever in the matter till Mr. Doherty, of Tipperary, opened up the affair again in the *Freeman* of the 18th July, 1909. In the *Freeman* of the next day Dr. Starke's private secretary, Mr. Phelan, contradicted Mr. Doherty's quotation. On the 12th I wrote affirming the accuracy of my report. A couple of further letters from Mr. Doherty ended Part I. of this drama. At the next Central Committee meeting on the 31st July, 1909, the members of the committee unanimously passed a resolution, an affidavit I might almost call it, affirming the correctness of my report. On the 10th August, 1909, Mr. Gamble, of Cork, wrote to the *Freeman*, half affirming, half denying, Dr. Starke's statement. Mr. Elliott, of Belfast, President at the time, wound up Part II. with a letter* in support of my report. I wish to point out that it was not the omission of the "Private and Confidential" mark, but the assertion re managers, that caused the trouble. The previous deputation report, December, 1907, was marked "Private and Confidential," yet its contents became known to the Connacht managers, and called forth their resolution of May, 1908. On this occasion also Mr. Gamble put a letter in the *Freeman* in favour of Dr. Starke. My fault, in Dr. Starke's eyes, lay, as will be seen later, in my vindication of my own honour. He seems to hold

* Vide Appendix LII.

the view that when the truth incriminated the official those under him should allow him to impugn their veracity without right of vindication of their character. In Dr. Starke's case he has absolute power owing to the supineness of a phibic Board, who delegated to him all their responsibility before God and man to protect those placed under their care by the State, and to see that the Ten Commandments are observed in dealing with them.

23864. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—This practical question seems to me to arise in this connection. You know that the question of giving notice of new rules has been placed before the Committee, and I think I am right in saying that Dr. Starke expressed his willingness before rules were put in force to receive deputations from the teachers upon them. Now suppose new rules were going to be introduced and deputations went up from your organisation or Executive, would it be possible to keep them confidential in the ordinary course, or should the report be communicated throughout your organisation?—Oh, it should be communicated throughout the organisation, the only effect of the Private and Confidential mark is that it would not be published in the Press. If a newspaper got hold of it and found that mark upon it they would not publish it.

23865. A conference with Dr. Starke without communication with the several branches of the organisation would be no use?—No. If rules were published in opposition to the wishes of the teachers the position of those on the deputation would be very unenviable because it would be considered that they acquiesced without making them known to the teachers.

23866. That is the point, that an arrangement for the discussion of the proposed rules with the Resident Commissioner would not be satisfactory unless it was understood that the proceedings of any conference with the Resident Commissioner would be sent to all the branches of your organisation?—Oh, certainly.

23867. And has it always been the practice to communicate the report of the deputation to the local associations?—Yes; marked "private and confidential," and the only effect of that mark is to keep them from being published in the Press.

23868. The CHAIRMAN.—Would one of these reports become known to hundreds of teachers in the country?—To 10,000 teachers, or at least to every associated teacher.

23869. Mr. CORREY.—The report would be sent to the secretaries of all the local associations and would be read by them for their members?—Yes.

Mr. HENRY.—Not only that, but sometimes when a deputation went and waited upon anybody while Congress was sitting, when they came back they made a statement to Congress, the only reservation being that it was not to be published in the Press, and publication in the Press would be regarded as the only violation of the conditions under which the deputation was received.

Mr. CORREY.—In fact a deputation would never be sent to the Resident Commissioner unless it was understood the result was to be communicated to the Association.

23870. The CHAIRMAN.—Was the Resident Commissioner aware that the report would be passed on to the Association?—He should be aware of it.

23871. Mr. HENRY.—Is there not a reference somewhere that he complained that the document was sent out to the teachers without its being first submitted to him?—He never made that complaint of a deputation before. They were marked private and confidential and sent out without ever being submitted to him.

23872. Mr. CORREY.—That was always the case of deputations to Sir Patrick Keenan and Mr. Redington; the report was never sent back to them for their approval?—No, neither were the reports of deputations to Mr. Birrell or Mr. Lloyd George ever sent back to them for emendation.

23873. The CHAIRMAN.—You mention the case of a Miss Shanahan, of Mullinahona National School, Ring, and you applied to Dr. Starke to receive an Arbitration Committee, which had been appointed; you were a member of that Committee, and he said he could not receive you; what was the meaning of his refusal?—

I will tell you.* On June 18th, 1910, I wrote Dr. Starke as follows:—"Sir,—A Joint Committee of Arbitration, consisting of two representatives from the Gaelic League, two representatives from the Central Committee of the I.N.T.O., with Professor Ross MacNeill, Vice-President Gaelic League, presiding, met in 25 Bedford Square, on Saturday, 11th July, to adjust the differences between the Gaelic League and the National Teachers' Organisation. As a result of this meeting, the Committee formed itself into a joint deputation, representing the Gaelic League and the I.N.T.O., to the Education Office, primarily on behalf of Miss Shanahan, Principal Teacher, Mullinahona G.N.S., Ring, and also with regard to the appointment of a competent Bilingual Teacher to Mullinahona, to advance the interests of Bilingual teaching in that district, without injury to the existing teacher. As Secretary to the Joint Committee, the duty devolved on me of asking you to receive this deputation, and to appoint the time at which you will kindly do so. If it were convenient to you to receive it on a Saturday, so that the teachers on it would not have to absent themselves from their schools on a week-day, we should be very thankful to you." Then I received, on the 20th June, 1910, the following reply:—"Madam,—In reply to your letter of the 18th inst., I am requested by the Resident Commissioner to say that before consenting to receive the deputation about which you write he will require to be furnished with the names of the persons who will take part in it." Then I wrote furnishing the names, and in his next letter he said: "Madam,—I am requested by the Resident Commissioner to inform you that he is not averse to receiving, as proposed, a joint deputation of the Gaelic League and the National Teachers' Organisation with reference to the case of Miss Shanahan, Mullinahona National School. Having regard, however, to certain incidents that followed his reception of National Teachers last year, he is not prepared to receive any deputation at present of which you might happen to be a member."

23874. That fills up a certain gap, some one now to the case of Miss Shanahan?—About this time Miss Shanahan of Mullinahona N.S., Ring, was threatened with dismissal by the Board if she did not qualify to teach Irish by a certain specified date. This coercion the teachers attributed to the pressure of the Gaelic League on the National Board. To save this teacher, and to adjust some other differences, an Arbitration Committee was appointed, consisting of two teachers from the Gaelic League, two from the Teachers' Organisation, with Professor MacNeill as Chairman. I was a member of, and acted as secretary to, this Committee, and in that capacity I applied to Dr. Starke to receive the Committee as a deputation to discuss the Ring case. Dr. Starke wrote back saying he would not see me. I knew that the other three teachers would not go without me if they knew I was barred, and the matter was very grave, as Miss Shanahan's eviction notice would soon expire, so I took on myself the responsibility of dropping out and arranging the interview for the other four members for the 2nd July, 1909, and notified them of the arrangement. Mr. McGowan acted as secretary on this deputation. To avoid any further unpleasantness, he submitted a draft of his report to Dr. Starke. He got it back totally changed, and when he submitted Dr. Starke's amended version to the Executive we could not accept it. Dr. Starke had promised the deputation that if an Irish-speaking assistant were appointed in Mullinahona to deal with the junior "Miss Shanahan could deal with the senior division on ordinary lines." When Mr. McGowan sent Dr. Starke the draft of the report, he introduced, as an emendation, "Miss Shanahan could deal with the senior division on ordinary lines for the next twelve months, during which time she should take steps to acquire a sufficient knowledge of Irish." The deputation most emphatically rejected that alternative. Miss Shanahan was a teacher of 17 years' service; she could not qualify for the Bilingualism in 12 months, and to try to do so with the sword of Damocles hanging over her head all the time would impair her health, to the detriment of her school. He agreed to the omission of any threat of the kind on the representations of the deputation, yet when they were gone out of his sight he introduced it again. The Arbitration Committee

* Vide Appendix LII.

had to meet again, and the deputation had to go back to Dr. Starke again on the 17th September, 1910, to get the report restored to the original agreement. Dr. Starke crossed out the amendment and initialled the crossing. I notice in the report of the last deputation, July, 1912, Dr. Starke repeats the conditions which he struck out under his initials in September, 1910. It promises can bind him, it is fortunate for Miss Shanahan that I have such a propensity for preserving documents, as she is under threat of eviction again. The fourth and final set of this drama between Dr. Starke and the Executive over my report occurred on the 5th November, 1910. A deputation was appointed in October, 1910, and when Mr. Doyle applied for recognition of the deputation Dr. Starke replied that he would see the deputation if Mr. O'Donnell and myself—members of the 1909 deputation—were excluded. Mr. Doyle wired the members, and afterwards called a special meeting to decide. At that meeting on 5th November, 1910, it was decided by resolution to send no deputation to Dr. Starke while he banned any member of the Executive. In other words, we declined to allow Dr. Starke to establish a right of selection and rejection from among the elected representatives of the Teachers' Organisation. An interchange of correspondence took place between Dr. Starke and myself, and the doors of Tyrone House were banged against us, except at the piers of our house and independence. We decided never again to seek an interview with Dr. Starke; neither did we ever since, neither shall we ever again, I hope. Allowing Dr. Starke to ban certain members from deputations would mean that if any value was to be set on deputations, those in disfavour with Dr. Starke should not be elected on the Executive, and this would ultimately mean giving Dr. Starke a veto on the elections of our Central Committee, and practically making the Organisation an arm of the Education Office, a sort of back-kitchen to Tyrone House. We cleared that of that. He has ample way over us, without allowing him to interfere in any exercise of the legitimate right of combination. Then there is the attribution of the Central Committee's attitude by the Organisation at the Bangor Congress, and as this report* will appear in the Appendix I need not read it, except the paragraph on civil rights, which caused a good deal of trouble. Dr. Starke said that the managers were opposed to the granting of civil rights, and mentioned that they had strong representation on the Board. He instanced the case of a manager who said: "How could he sit on the same Board with a teacher who was in his employ?" He also said that Mr. Birrell did us harm instead of good over the civil rights question, as he set up the backs of members of the Board by his remarks on this question. Adverting to the development grant, Dr. Starke said that undoubtedly the Irish members of Parliament were responsible for the loss of the £185,000; that it was with their consent it was diverted from Irish education and used for Land Act purposes.

25375. Mr. CORREY.—Dr. Starke said that the Irish members were responsible for the loss of the £185,000, and that with their consent it was diverted from Irish education and used for Land Act purposes. In his evidence before this Committee he made a charge to my mind of a very serious character against a great man who is now dead. Mr. Wyndham, who was Chief Secretary for Ireland, and he said this money was diverted, and that Mr. Wyndham made an attack upon the National Board as an excuse for diverting the money which he wanted for Land Act purposes at the time. Did Dr. Starke say to your deputation that it was diverted at the request of the Irish members?—Yes, with their consent, and Dr. Starke himself made out a case for the sequestration of the Grant at the time in 1905 by the statement that the Irish people were interested in everything but education. That £185,000 was in the balance for six months when he made his speech in Belfast in 1902 and he never alluded to it. On the contrary, he made a strong case for local rating, and the arguments he used in Belfast in 1902 were afterwards repeated by Mr. Wyndham in making his case for the sequestration of the Grant.

25376. Mr. HENRY.—Did he not put forward a great many reasons showing that the teachers were better off than they professed to be?—Yes, in the 1904 report he tried to show in 29 paragraphs that

they had no ground for grievance as compared with the English teachers.

25377. The CHAIRMAN.—The only tangible result of this discussion with the deputation to Dr. Starke on the 5th February, 1909, was that he said (1) the rule making increments depending on it would not appear next time; (2) that inspectors would be instructed not to press cookery and laundry where managers refused to supply equipment and waste provisions for their introduction; (3) that these subjects would not be required in any school in which there were not 12 girls over 11 years of age, and (4) that where introduced experimental science could be dropped and a modified programme on other subjects could be submitted. What have you to say about that?—These promises were not kept.

25378. Have you anything to say generally on the whole discussion about cookery and laundry?—I don't agree with Dr. Starke that cookery was more important than reading, writing, and arithmetic.

25379. Mr. KAVANAGH.—Would anybody say that?—He said it was the most important of all the school subjects, that it was more important than reading, writing, and arithmetic.

He must mean in conjunction with something else. Nobody would make a statement of that sort.

25380. The CHAIRMAN.—There must be some other consideration?—As the result of the agitation that I conducted at that time over this business of threatening teachers with a denial of increments unless they introduced cookery, and particularly after the Dublin Congress of 1910, most of the deferred increments were paid and there has not been much trouble since.

25381. Mr. CORREY.—That is deferred increments?—Yes, on account of cookery. Up to that time it was the general rule to defer increments and to notify the managers that unless cookery was introduced the increment would not be paid. I mentioned that to Dr. Starke, and he said that they were only threatened.

25382. The CHAIRMAN.—Was the teacher before that asked to provide the equipment for teaching cookery?—The Board did not care who provided it so long as it was done.

25383. It must be done?—Yes. They took no account of who provided the equipment. Then I went to refer to a letter I wrote with regard to the deputation, the report of which was in a few cases through accident not marked "private and confidential."

25384. Sir HENRY WILKINSON.—Before dealing with that, I find that in your notes with regard to the dignity of averages there is a point which does not seem to have been put before, and that is the suggestion with regard to the reduction of averages that there should be a withdrawal or a reduction of the assistant's salary in proportion to the deficiency in the number of children rather than have the salary reduced altogether?—We made that suggestion at the time rather than that the assistants should be dismissed altogether. If the average was 50, and suppose it went down to 40 the assistant was dismissed, and we made a proposal that it would be better to reduce the salary by one-fifth rather than have her dismissed, but we got a better condition.

25385. That is what you call the "swing of ten"?—Yes.

25386. So you don't want us to take into account any proposal based upon that reduction by one-fifth of the assistants salary?—Oh, no.

25387. The CHAIRMAN.—It really came to nothing?—No.

25388. Now there is a letter* of the 27th March, 1909, to which you want to refer?—Yes. It shows I did my best to remedy the commission of the mark "private and confidential."

25389. You give an account of how these words were omitted?—Yes, and I did my best to rectify the mistake.

25390. Then we come to the letter* of Father Curry, St. Mary's, Drogheda?—I have practically summarised all that in my letter. Father Curry published that resolution of the managers in 1907 showing that as far as the Catholic Managers were concerned Dr. Starke's statements that they were opposed to civil rights were inaccurate. Then there was a letter* from Mr. Delaherty.

16th September, 1913.]

Miss C. M. Manton examined.

[Continued.]

23390. Mr. Doherty raised the question again, and he elicited the contradictions from Dr. Starke's?—Yes. Dr. Starke's contradiction is as follows:—

"To the Editor of the *Freeman's Journal*."

"Office of National Education,

"Marlborough Street, Dublin,

"16th July, 1909.

"Dear Sir,—In a letter which appears in the *Freeman's Journal* of this date, the following passage occurs:—

"It is now something better than three months since Father Curry, of Drogheda, made public in the columns of the *Freeman*—the exact date is 18th April last—that the Resident Commissioner, Dr. Starke, stated to a deputation that waited on him that it was the representatives of the managers on the Board who were opposed to granting civil rights to the teachers."

"The Resident Commissioner desires me to give an emphatic contradiction to this representation of what he said to the deputation. It would appear that Father Curry adopted as his authority for the quotation in his letter of 18th April, 1909, the garbled report of a confidential interview, which was most unwarrantably published without being submitted to Dr. Starke.—Yours faithfully,

"M. A. PHELAN."

I want to point out that it is never was the custom to submit a report of any deputation to Dr. Starke, so there is no justification for saying it was published without being submitted to him since it was never the custom to do so.

23391. Somebody might have submitted a report?—Yes, after me, but not before. I will quote for you a question asked by Mr. Callinan with regard to civil rights and the denial of Dr. Starke. "Mr. Callinan asked the Chief Secretary whether his attention has been called to the report of the deputation of teachers who waited on the Resident Commissioner of National Education in connection, amongst other questions, with that of their civil rights, when Dr. Starke stated that the Chief Secretary did the teachers more harm than good over the civil rights question, as he set up the backs of the members of the National Board on the question; whether the members of the National Board and managers are opposed to granting civil rights to teachers; and whether he is prepared to take the necessary steps to have the Irish National teachers permitted to share in the privileges enjoyed by their fellow citizens?"

"Mr. Birrell.—My attention has been called to the report referred to, and I have also seen a letter from the Resident Commissioner denying its authenticity. I am informed that the question of the civil rights of teachers was considered by the Commissioners of National Education on several occasions in 1906 and 1907, when the restrictions imposed on teachers were relaxed to a considerable extent. The Commissioners do not think that it would be in the interests of the teachers or the schools to modify still further the rules on the subject. The responsibility in this matter rests entirely with the Commissioners, and I do not propose to take action with regard to it." Dr. Starke in his letter to the *Freeman's Journal* denied

the statement about the managers and Dr. Starke in reply to Mr. Birrell denied his statement with regard to the Chief Secretary. It has been the general practice with him always to deny everything that was inconvenient.

23392. Mr. O'Doherty in another letter* deals with the interview with Dr. Starke?—I handed in that so that it may not be said that I suppressed anything, and then there is my letter in which I give an account of the circumstances. In reply to Dr. Starke's indictment I wrote this letter in vindication of myself as the writer of the impeached report:—

"To the Editor of the *Freeman's Journal*."

"Carrig, Birr, 21st July, 1909.

"Sir,—The statement made in Mr. Phelan's reply to Mr. Doherty in your issue of the 26th July is, strictly speaking, a matter for the whole Central Committee, which adopted and published the report alluded to, rather than for me individually. But as this Committee will not meet for some time, I wish, as the writer of the report, to say a few words in my own justification. I did my best to produce a detailed verbatim report of the interview as faithfully and accurately as I possibly could in the absence of a knowledge of shorthand and taking into account the fact that Dr. Starke is the chief of the department under which I work in my capacity of teacher. It is but natural to suppose that I should take particular pains to be as courteous and diplomatic as possible, while at the same time striving to adhere firmly to the truth. I had also the assistance of a verbal report made on the same day to a sub-committee, and the further help of the memory of the sub-committee afterwards with regard to this verbal report.

"With the fact of the report being published without being submitted to Dr. Starke I have nothing to do. The Central Secretary had been for many years accustomed to all manner of deputations, and it is to be expected that he followed the customary procedure in such cases. I am unable to say what that procedure is till the next general meeting of the Central Committee." If you notice I took particular care to show that I did not directly contradict Dr. Starke in that letter.

23393. The CHAIRMAN.—Then we come on to July 21st?—Yes, a meeting of the Central Executive was held and the following resolution was unanimously adopted:—"That as the accuracy of the printed report of a deputation from this Committee to Dr. Starke in December last has been publicly discussed in the *Freeman's Journal*, and as the particular portion of this report which is questioned is the following: 'Dr. Starke stated the managers were opposed to the granting of civil rights,' we now desire to state that the deputations were unanimous in reporting this statement, and we adhere to our opinion that the printed report is an accurate representation of what occurred at the interview in December last."

23394. There is a letter* from Mr. F. Gamble in which he seems to say that what Dr. Starke said was that some managers were opposed to giving civil rights?—Mr. Gamble did Dr. Starke far more injury than I did, for I most carefully avoided contradicting him, whereas Mr. Gamble's statement half affirms and half denies his statement, he offers the statement with the qualification of the adjective "some."

* Vide Appendix LII.

FIFTY-SECOND DAY.—WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17th, 1913.

At 23, Kildare-street, Dublin.

Present:—SIR SAMUEL DILL, M.A., LL.D., LL.D. (Chairman); SIR HERMAN SEAW WILKINSON, LL.D.;

MR. JOHN COFFEY; MR. JEREMIAH HENLY; and

MR. ARTHUR J. DONNELLY, M.A., B.Sc., Secretary.

MISS CATHERINE M. MAHON, President, Irish National Teachers' Organisation, further examined.

23395. SIR HERMAN WILKINSON.—Referring to the disadvantage the teachers were at who were charged with inefficiency, you said they received no warning to prepare them for the final examination, and you said that they were better off with a three years' warning than without it?—Yes.

23396. You are familiar I suppose with Mr. Power's evidence with regard to reprimands, published in our first volume of evidence?—I don't quite recall it now, but I have read it.

23397. I understand Mr. Stewie looked upon these in the nature of a warning to teachers, and I think he was quite prepared to consider the abolition of these reprimands, but the question was whether some teachers would not thereby be put in a worse position than if that practice continued? I understand from you that you do wish that there should be warnings but you do not wish for the reprimands?—In the volume of evidence of which you speak this occurs:—"Teachers who have incurred any serious censure during the three years preceding are ineligible for promotion." Don't you see now that a reprimand administered by a clerk in the office is a very serious matter for a teacher, because it stops increment and promotion, and it has been doing that all these years without the knowledge of the Board. The teachers never knew that these reprimands were in the nature of the year's warning, or that they would block increment and promotion. You say that reprimands should be in the nature of warnings to the teacher, but the teacher didn't know that the reprimands had any bearing on increment or promotion or dismissal.

23398. The question arises more particularly at present with regard to teachers charged with inefficiency. I understand you would do away altogether with the system followed with regard to reprimands?—Yes.

23399. But inasmuch as that has been looked upon in the nature of a warning, if it was recommended that that should be abolished it would be desirable that very clear ideas should be expressed with regard to what should take the place in the case of a teacher who was inefficient, and who might without warning be dismissed?—It should be very distinctly stated in the rules. Hitherto there was nothing in the rules to indicate that these reprimands were warnings of future punishment for inefficiency.

23400. Then am I right in assuming that you consider that the rules should be made definite, and that in the absence of special circumstances, in the case of inefficiency no teacher should be dismissed unless twice or three times warned or unless at any rate after a year's warning?—But in the case of a teacher warned like that there should be an appeal and proper investigation by the Board.

23401. I know, but you would have a warning?—Oh, I would have a warning, but only after the fullest trial by the Board, and a chance given to the teacher to make up his defence. I would not have any warning or reprimand or censure sent to a teacher until that teacher had got the fullest and fairest trial, and was then given the ground on which the warning was sent and until the teacher was awarded the fullest opportunity for making his defence, even before the warning was sent.

23402. Does it occur to you that if a teacher was told that his teaching, in the opinion of the Inspector, was such as to call for censure in some way, the teacher might feel that that was fully justified, but you wish to put the warning after trial, but I ask you why not before trial, and let the teacher appeal if he wishes?—Because the warning would stand against him, and that warning would be taken into

account whether justified or not in the future awarding of his increments or promotion, so I hold he should not get a warning until it is proved that the warning was justifiable; he might get a notification but he should not be warned until after his trial.

23403. Don't you think accusation should precede trial?—Yes; but it should be a notification, and the teacher should get the fullest trial before any reprimand is registered. Reprimand is an actual block to increment and promotion. In the Independent Mr. Leamas made it appear that these were not administered without the sanction of the Board, in a way that is literally true, but what I said in my speech is also true that a reprimand is a bigger fine than a fine, because it leads to the stoppage of increment and promotion, and towards the end of one's career it cuts off one or two or three years of the time during which a teacher would be earning the maximum salary, and these reprimands are administered by clerks in the office who have the power of administering reprimands and filing teachers in their hands; that is the logic of it.

23404. You desire that the system of reprimand by an Examiner should be done away with?—Yes.

23405. But that the system of warning should remain?—Yes; a teacher should not be dismissed without a legalised system of warning specially and definitely marked out.

23406. You advocated, I think, doing away with the merit marks?—Yes.

23407. Then, suppose a teacher in the opinion of the Inspector showed gross inefficiency?—That would appear in the full report.

23408. You would desire that that should appear in the full report?—Yes.

23409. That in the annual report the Inspector, if he considers there is such inefficiency as would call for action on the part of the Board, and should say so, that should be intimated to the teacher in some form, and the teacher if he disagrees with that should have the opportunity of having the matter considered?—He should have an appeal within a reasonable time against that if he considers it is not justified; and if he considers it is justified it remains with him to try and make up the deficiency.

23410. You say at first you would have nothing remain against him until there was a trial, but I was suggesting that the teacher might feel that he would not do any better by a trial; such cases of course occur; it would be right enough that he should be warned that he is accused of inefficiency, and anything that he has to say upon his own behalf might be received, and if it is not satisfactory it should be recorded against him?—Yes; after he has had a warning for inefficiency. Of course I was thinking at first of trifles like marking rolls, and so on.

23411. You wish to do away with the reprimand by Examiners altogether, but that in the case it would be to the advantage of the teacher that he should be warned of what might occur to him, and that such warning should be given in the form of a statement that he is accused of inefficiency?—Yes, of course that would be in the case of inefficiency, and I need not repeat what I said about having the right to appeal and a fair trial before that is registered.

23412. If he wishes to have an appeal he should have an opportunity of having the matter reheard, as I understand from your previous evidence, by two Chief Inspectors?—Yes, and if he is vindicated on rehearing that reprimand should be abolished.

23413. MR. HENLY.—And that report cancelled?—Yes.

17th September, 1913.]

Miss C. M. MAHON examined.

[Continued.]

Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—If the censure is not justified.

23414. The CHAIRMAN.—I will put it for the sake of further clearance in this way. I understand you wish this reprimand issued by the Examiners perhaps for trivial things to be abolished—in fact all reprimands to be abolished. When you have done that you must put something in their place. Would you propose a rule requiring that the full general report should be sent down to the Manager and teacher within ten days of the visit to the school so that if that report is unfavourable what Sir Hiram has elicited from you might take place?—Yes.

23415. That is the point of the abolition of the reprimand?—Yes.

23416. And that full reports not extracts should be sent down to the Manager and teacher a certain number of days after the inspections, and if that report contained severe reprimands for inefficiency the teacher should have an opportunity of making his answer?—Yes.

23417. And should have an appeal?—Yes.

23418. Mr. COFFEY.—Apart from reprimands or censures for inefficiency are you aware that censures or reprimands have been issued for some technical breach of the rules, and that these have militated against the promotion of a teacher?—That is what I say.

23419. Though Dr. Starke or some official witness seem to think those reprimands were of very little account you think they are of very great account as regards the teacher, although such a reprimand has nothing to do with the working of the school it operates against him for promotion?—Yes, certainly.

23420. The CHAIRMAN.—What I want is something between the abolition of reprimands and the substitution of the full general report going to the teacher, that would let him know he has been accused. Perhaps we may go on to your point. There is your letter of 16th August, 1909, on National Teachers' Civil Rights?—Yes, that relates to Mr. Gamble's attitude, and the second letter from Mr. Elliott was in vindication of my report against Mr. Gamble's opinion. Then we have dealt with the next letter of June 18th.*

23421.—The CHAIRMAN.—We pass on then to the meeting of the Central Executive Committee held on the 5th November?—We made a further application to Dr. Starke, and Dr. Starke in reply said he would see the deputation if I was excluded, and also Mr. O'Callaghan.*

23422. He mentioned the number he would see?—Yes; three. He would not see me. Then we held a special meeting, but I need not go into that.

23423. Then there is a letter* from Mr. Doyle of Ballymore?—That was a correspondence he had with Dr. Starke with regard to my explanation.

23424. And then came the reply from the Resident Commissioner still insisting that he was not prepared to receive Miss Mahon?—Yes. 1. The following resolution was proposed by Mr. Thompson, seconded by Mr. McGill:—"That a deputation from the C.E.C. be appointed to wait upon Dr. Starke with respect to Housing and Cleaning, Civil Rights, Mathematics, Tenure of Assistants, Deductions from Salaries of Deputations, and Monthly Salaries." To this an amendment was proposed by Mr. Nash, seconded by Mr. McGroarty:—"That no deputation to Dr. Starke proceed from the C.E.C. while he refuses to receive certain members of this body."

23425. The CHAIRMAN.—And the amendment was carried?—Yes; and that finished our deputations to Dr. Starke.

23426. Since that day you never sent a deputation to Dr. Starke?—No.

23427. Now, we come to your vindication of your conduct in this matter.* It is most important, but I think you need not read it, but tell us in brief for the sake of the reader what actually happened with regard to the publication of that report of the deputation to Dr. Starke. You took a verbatim report, and you stand by that report as accurate?—

Yes. I took a verbatim report, and presented it to our Committee, and the Committee approved of it, and ordered it to be circulated through the Secretaries of the Association marked "Private and Confidential."

23428. That was part of your order?—Yes, that was part of the Central Committee's arrangement.

23429. What followed after that?—Our Central Secretary, Dr. Clarke, revised it, and got it ready for printing, and after he got it ready he sent it to me, and I sent it on to the printer, and it was only afterwards, when I got it back from the printer, that I noticed that the words "Private and Confidential" were omitted. Some copies had previously gone out, the remaining copies were in the hands of Dr. Clarke. I communicated with him immediately, he then marked all the copies in his possession "Private and Confidential" in red ink, and he sent out post cards to the Secretaries of Associations asking them to mark their copies "Private and Confidential," and I put a letter in the Irish School Journal the next Saturday explaining the omission and asking all who had copies without the mark to mark them "Private and Confidential."

23430. What strikes one as odd is, how a document circulated all over the country could be regarded as private and confidential?—It could not, of course; the only effect of the private and confidential mark was that if the Newspaper people got hold of it they would not publish it in the press.

23431. Mr. HENLY.—Is it not the rule that in all such cases the printed report of the interview is sent to the Association?—It is sent to 210 Secretaries of 210 Associations, and each Secretary is to circulate the contents of that document to all the members of his association.

23432. The CHAIRMAN.—Did Dr. Starke object to any report being taken of this deputation?—Never; but he makes a statement* with regard to it, which I want to contradict.

23433. It was distinctly understood, he says, that the proceedings of the interview were to be of a confidential character, and that were any report to be issued it should consist merely of a brief summary of the subjects discussed. What reply do you make to that?—I say we understood the deputation was to be confidential in the ordinary sense, such as we always regarded them as confidential, that is that the reports were to be marked "Private and Confidential," but no deputation ever came to an understanding with Dr. Starke that no report should be published, or only a summary. I contradicted that in my letter, and in a further letter Dr. Starke in effect contradicted himself.

23434. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Yesterday when I put a question to you with regard to difficulties that might be found in case you had conferences with the Board with regard to future rules and the question of "Private and Confidential," you mentioned that the meaning of that expression was merely to prevent its publication in the press, but if Dr. Starke and the Board adhered to their view of the meaning of "Private and Confidential" would any conference of the Board on the publication of private rules be of any use whatever?—I adhere to what I said in my letter. We could not accept conferences on that understanding, because we must make known what transpires to the Associated teachers, and take their views upon it.

23435. The CHAIRMAN.—And no conference would be of any use to you unless you had that opportunity?—No.

23436. Mr. COFFEY.—And no conference would take place?—No.

23437. The CHAIRMAN.—I just want to put this case. It is a very serious question that Sir Hiram has raised, that is as to whether there should be conferences about new rules. Would the teachers of Ireland not leave their case in the hands of their representatives, to meet in confidential conference the representatives of the Board as to new rules?—You mean in the initial stage.

23438. In the Intermediate Board representative teachers come to discuss a new rule with representatives of the Board, there is no report of that, except a

* Vide Appendix I.II.

perfectly private one circulated among ourselves?—Sill, is not what transpired at these conferences circulated amongst Head Masters either by conference or private letters.

23439. The CHAIRMAN.—Not that we are aware of. Would such a conference with trusted representatives of the teachers of Ireland say on a proposed new rule not suffice? Would not the teachers of Ireland trust their case in your hands?—They would. We could not in the way you suggest in regard to matters where we knew the teachers would be agreed upon the question, but in case of new rules and new developments on which we had not tested the opinion of the members of our organisation we would have to take a census of their opinion.

23440. You would have to take a vote of the teachers?—Yes. We would have to do that. There are many cases on which we could decide without appealing to the teachers, because we know their minds.

23441. Mr. HENLY.—You are only an executive Committee?—Yes; that is so.

23442. And you have to act in accordance with the rules and regulations laid down by Congress?—Yes, and I could confer with the National Board upon many questions, upon which I know the minds of the teachers, but upon something new or unexpected, such as 127 (b) or 95 (f). I could not take that upon myself without first putting the matter before the teachers, and ascertaining their views.

23443. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—The letter of *Mr. Beaupre Wyse, dated the 6th of September, 1910, shows the difference of your view from that of Dr. Starke as to what was understood to be meant by "Private and Confidential"?—As to what was understood to be meant by what transpired at that deposition.

23444. May I take it that what you have done was entirely in accordance with the agreement, as you understood it, and that the difference is that Dr. Starke says he understood it in a different way?—Yes.

23445. And you think that your understanding is the more reasonable one, and you gave us your ground for thinking so?—Yes.

23446. The CHAIRMAN.—But there is one important statement in the letter of 6th December 1910, to this effect:—"The Resident Commissioner was asked by a member of the deputation, who, to the best of his belief was yourself, whether he objected to a report of the proceedings for the purposes of the organisation, and he replied that 'anything of the nature of a detailed confidential report was out of the question.'" Dr. Starke really didn't object to a report at all?—As I mentioned at the time there was not the smallest particle of ground for that statement. All I can say now is that that never happened.

23447. You deny that?—Yes; I totally deny it, and further down in that letter he says:—"You scattered broadcast verbatim reports of interview which he had expressly forbidden." I totally and emphatically deny that.

23448. The question I asked is—whether Dr. Starke didn't object to any report?—Dr. Starke didn't make the slightest objection. In his letter to our secretary he mentioned that the deputation would be private and confidential, that is customary and formal, and when speaking on the question of civil rights he said—"I may tell you this," and so, "and it is very confidential," but he did not say it should not go into the report, and he knew we would not see him at all if there was any matter we should be asked to suppress or conceal from the teachers in any way.

23449. He says he objects to this being communicated to thousands of teachers?—But everything that happened on deputations before that was communicated to thousands of teachers. And he also says there was an opportunity given to the Resident Commissioner to revise what was written previous to the report going out; but there never was previously any opportunity afforded to any Resident Commissioner to revise the reports of deputations.

* Vide Appendix LII.

23450. I think we have sufficiently cited that now. You give a point blank denial to his charges?—Yes to everything he has stated.

23451. We now come to the appointment of Mr. Ward as a Commissioner. Did you make representations to the Board to have a teacher appointed on the Board?—Yes. We made representations to the Irish Executive—we had been asking for this for sixteen years. A teachers' deputation waited on Mr. Birrell on the 14th July, 1910, and Mr. Ward's appointment was made in September.

23452. You asked for it on more than one occasion?—Yes. I find in the minutes of the organisation for 1897 that they asked for a Protestant and Catholic teacher as members of the Board as far back as that time.

23453. You go on to say that Mr. Ward won some minor successes?—Yes.

23454. Then you come to the question of docking the pay from the year's salary for each day that you are serving on a deputation?—Yes, on educational matters.

23455. Is that deduction still made?—Yes. Mr. Nunn went on a deputation to Mr. Birrell, and obtained the promise of the "Swing of ten" in the average for assistants, it was a great concession, and the Board subsequently passed a resolution favouring it, although they had previously declared that they didn't consider it a desirable thing, and in a subsequent report they took the credit of having obtained it and Mr. Nunn's reward was that his salary was docked for the four days during which he was absent on that deputation to Mr. Birrell in London.

23456. You refer next to a deputation to Mr. John Redmond. For what purpose do you bring that in?—For this reason to show his opinion on this docking of salaries. I was two days absent with a deputation to the Women's National Health Association, and my salary was not docked. I was two days absent in connection with the deputation to Mr. Redmond, my salary was docked.

23457. Did you state for what reason you were absent from your school?—Oh, yes, in the quarterly returns.

23458. So that the persons who had authority knew the reason why you were absent on the first as well as on the second occasion?—Yes.

23459. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—Would you draw a distinction between a deputation to one of His Majesty's Ministers and a deputation to a Member of Parliament as to how it should affect your salary?—In a sense I agree that it is different, but both were on educational matters.

23460. You see if you are on a deputation to one of His Majesty's Ministers you act as if were on Government business?—Yes.

23461. If you go to a private Member of Parliament, no doubt you are trying to get some purpose served, but then you might have deputations to Members of Parliament all the year around, and that would be quite a different thing from the time occupied in attending on a Minister, the attendance on whom was sanctioned, and the time occupied in waiting on a private Member of Parliament?—I might draw a distinction, but Mr. Redmond is Leader of a Parliamentary Party, and not an ordinary member.

23462. You mentioned a deputation to Mr. Redmond and to Mr. Birrell, and you recognise that these two stand on a different footing in that way?—But my salary was docked on both of those occasions.

23463. The CHAIRMAN.—The Treasury made no such distinction?—No.

Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—I only wanted to make quite sure you were not making a point beyond what you wanted to make.

The CHAIRMAN.—Miss Mahon makes the point that she was not docked on another occasion.

23464. Mr. HENLY.—Had you the leave of the Manager to attend these deputations?—Yes, I could not go without the leave of the Manager.

23465. Of course you are aware that under rule 92 (c) provision is made for the occasional brief absence of teachers owing to illness or other reasonable cause, and that the Manager's statement may be accepted?—Yes.

17th September, 1913]

Miss C. M. MARION examined.

[Continued.]

23466. Therefore, according to that rule if the Manager gave you permission the usual course is to pay the salary?—Yes, the Manager sent on the report agreeing to my absence.

23467. Therefore, stopping your salary in this case was an unusual proceeding under the Board?—Yes; certainly harsh, considering we were absent on educational matters, trying to get concessions for the benefit of the Irish school as well as the Irish teachers.

23468. If you are absent on family matters with the Manager's consent there would be no stoppage of salary?—No.

23469. The CHAIRMAN.—You have a note next on 92 (j)* in 1911?—Yes. I have not gone into the merits of the rule, but if you wish me I will express an opinion.

23470. No; we have had it before?—We passed a resolution upon this matter, and sent it to the National Board.

23471. Was any question raised with regard to the legality of the rule 92 (j)?—Yes.

23472. And it was submitted for legal opinion?—It was.

23473. Sir HERAM WILKINSON.—The Board have taken such advice as they thought desirable, and abolished the rule as regards married women already in the service, but maintain the rule still with regard to teachers, who after the publication of the rule may enter the service. Am I right in that?—Yes you are right; they have reduced the time from three to two months, but the most inexcusable part of the rule is that it deprives a teacher mother of the month's leave of absence allowed by the Treasury in case of illness. Rule 92 (a) says:—"In cases of prolonged illness one month's leave of absence is allowed without stoppage of salary on the production of a doctor's certificate. Rule 92 (j) deliberately nullifies this by introducing an opening clause, 'notwithstanding anything contained in the preceding portion of this rule married women are required to absent themselves from their school for three months continuously during the period preceding and succeeding child-birth, and to provide qualified substitutes at their own expense.'" If the Commissioners had made a rule that in addition to the ordinary month's leave allowed by the rule, married ladies should absent themselves for another period it would be harsh enough, but to sweep away from the married lady the month allowed by the rule, and to fine her a quarter of her salary and emoluments for each birth was the climax of cruelty, and was a voluntary act on the part of the Commissioners. The Treasury could devise nothing as harsh, arbitrary, and illegal as that rule. That is one of the inexcusable things, why they retire the married teacher without allowing her that short period, namely, the one month's absence without stoppage of salary, allowed even by their own rules, and allowed by the Treasury.

23474. The CHAIRMAN.—I see your point?—Why not allow the one month allowed by the rule, even if they require her to retire for a longer period.

23475. You say that this month should be taken into account in her favour?—Yes; that she should be allowed the one month. I have broken my ankle, and can get one month's leave of absence, without stoppage of pay, but that month is taken away from the mother teacher, and she is required to retire, and pay a substitute at her own expense for the whole time; that is a harsh and illegal condition.

23476. Sir HERAM WILKINSON.—I think it would be desirable to have the views of the teachers' Organisation upon this rule with regard to married ladies already in the service. As I take it from you you consider it unreasonable that a teacher who under these circumstances is allowed three months' absence should have to provide a substitute for the whole period?—As in the case of the London County Council a substitute should be provided if the lady is retired, and that substitute should be provided by the Board. The London County Council requires a married teacher to retire for a certain time, but the London County Council allows that teacher's salary to go on, and they have a list of unattached teachers and they put one of them in her place, and pay her for that time, the married teacher has no trouble or expense.

23477. That represents I take it the view of the Organisation?—It is my view, the Organisation demands complete withdrawal of the rule in its present form.

23478. And there would be this other consideration that when a married teacher is absent for three months, and provides such substitute as she is able to obtain, it is quite possible if not probable that that substitute would not be up to the full efficiency?—Yes.

The CHAIRMAN.—We had it from one witness that a bad report was due to one of these causes.

23479. Sir HERAM WILKINSON.—If there was a list of unattached teachers these teachers would probably be competent persons, and this difficulty would not arise?—At present some of these ladies find it impossible to get a substitute for any consideration. They put an advertisement in the papers and they write to their friends, and very often they cannot get a substitute. Before the Board puts such a rule into force they should have a list of teachers unemployed and eligible.

23480. And willing to take up the position?—No teacher unemployed now would be willing to take up a position temporarily under the existing circumstances.

23481. They might not be willing to take it unless that they understood that the Board employed them. For instance, a teacher living in Cork might not be willing to come up to a little school in Donegal?—That is true, the late backward and forward would absorb the whole payment.

23482. So you ask that the Board should provide substitutes and make proper arrangements for the providing of such substitute without any charge upon the woman teacher?—I think the utmost interests of humanity require that. The poor woman is less able to afford the fine at that time than at any other. My opinion is that no rule should be enforced until such time as the Board can make such provision.

23483. The CHAIRMAN.—Will you now go on to your reference to Belfast and Tipperary teachers' appeals. You have a limited purpose in referring to that?—Yes.

23484. What is the purpose?—To prove misadministration on the part of the Board. During this year 1911 the Belfast and Tipperary teachers appealed to the Board for redress of their inspection grievances. On the 6th February, 1911, the Belfast teachers presented an appeal by deputation to Dr. Starke. In both cases the Chiefs were sent to investigate, and in both cases the Chiefs sided with the Inspectors.*

23485. Did the Tipperary teachers make a different request to be received by deputation?—They did.

Have we got that?—

Mr. HENRY.—I don't think it appeared in our proceedings.

23486. The CHAIRMAN.—My attention was not called to it?—The letter of the Secretary presenting the case and asking for the deputation does not appear in your evidence, but it is mentioned in the pamphlet, and here is an extract:—"If the Commissioners are willing to receive some members of our body regarding the subject of this memorial we shall be prepared to send a deputation."

23487. That request was made by the Secretary of the Clonmel Association?—Yes, when forwarding the memorial. The Tipperary teachers were not even allowed to present their appeal by deputation, they had to send it by post in June, 1911, and that of course precluded all discussion or explanation. The Tipperary teachers, however, did not contemplate sitting down in sullen and hopeless discontent, as the Belfast teachers were forced to do, they were conscious of great wrongs, and when the ordinary red tape procedure of the Board failed to concede redress they were driven to more forcible methods. Then there was Dr. Starke's sensational disclosures in his 1911 address.

23488. What is the relation of this to the text?—Dr. Starke gave his views of the relations that should exist between the Inspectors and the teachers which throws light on the treatment of the teachers from 1900 onward. He made some professions there which to the teachers seem strangely at variance

* Vide Appendix I.II.

with practice. In that address he makes public for the first time that the policy of the Tory Government was a policy of starvation of Irish education. Then I give extracts from his address, but these have already appeared, so I'll pass on."

Mr. HENLEY.—We have a statement in the Blue Book that the Commissioners are willing to receive some members of your body regarding the subject of the memorial.

23488. The CHAIRMAN.—You contrast what you term the 1911 admissions with the 1902 attacks?—Yes. At the time (1902) when the Board was desperate for want of money, and was forced to inflict injustice on the teachers with the new scheme and to break Archbishop Walsh's pledge to the teachers, Dr. Starke could have avoided all the unpleasantness by confiding in the teachers, and joining with them in the demand for the increased funds.

23489. What was the pledge of Archbishop Walsh?—That no teacher should suffer by the change. Instead of that Dr. Starke went to Belfast in 1902, and made a most offensive attack on the Teachers' Organisation for daring to complain, instead of being grateful for their privileges—privileges which as it now transpires only existed in his theories. What is the good of disclosing in 1911 the cause of wrongs done in 1902. What confidence can be placed in a man who takes nine years to admit the truth, and then only in view of the approaching dissolution of the Board. In his Belfast address, Dr. Starke delivered the following beautiful platitude:—"The old system was objectionable because it made slaves of the teachers and inspectors. I have recently been told that they are still slaves. If so, they are largely themselves, both teachers and inspectors, to blame. Freedom of teaching, organisation, and inspection is the watchword of the Board. Without manliness and self-respect a teacher's influence is naught with his pupils; and the Board is determined to support any measures calculated to raise the status of the teaching profession, which hitherto has not received a tithe of the honour and respect due to those whose hands the destinies of the rising generation are committed for better or for worse." And then he went back to the office and fostered this "manliness and self-respect" by refusing both the Belfast and Tipperary appeals, making the teachers feel that as far as the Board was concerned they were slaves without rights of men, crushing down the Belfast teachers into sullen and hopeless discontent, and instilling the Tipperary teachers into feelings of revolt. During this year the repeated requests of the Organisation for thirteen years prevailed at last, and on the 9th July, 1912, the Commissioners consented to receive a deputation from the Teachers' Organisation for the first time in their long and shameful history. The report of that deputation shows you the weight to be attached to Dr. Starke's assertions in his controversy with me about the summary reports of deputations being agreed upon. There you have that deputation of the 9th July, 1912, of which a verbatim report was taken down by a shorthand writer in the Education Office, and every single word recorded in black and white, and circulated amongst 10,000 members of our association. Still, it suited him when he wanted to put me down to say that only a summary should be published.

23490. The CHAIRMAN.—The deputation of the Belfast teachers was regularly reported?—Yes.

23491. Mr. HENLEY.—But Dr. Starke did not circulate it himself?—No, he gave it to me for circulation, that is the material deputation report.

23492. The CHAIRMAN.—He permitted a reporter to be present when he received the Belfast teachers?—Yes.

It was with his full knowledge—

Mr. HENLEY.—Yes, and he got the report printed.

23493. The CHAIRMAN.—Was that a deputation to the full Board?—Yes; the only deputation we had to the full Board.

23494. Were you present at it?—No. I did not go.

23495. Sir HIRSH WILKINSON.—I see that this report is marked "confidential." I suppose it was treated as confidential in the way you have described, that it was not to go to the press, but was to go to the branches of the organisation?—Yes. Previously, in October, 1911, and January, 1912, they had asked Managers and teachers to send deputations to confer with them on the subjects of higher grade schools and scholarships. The Teachers' Organisation sent Mr. Mansfield to look after the teachers' interests on both occasions, and Mr. Ward afterwards told us that Dr. Starke was particularly impressed with Mr. Mansfield's great intellectual ability. In the light of recent events I think it right to mention this:—On the 8th August, 1912, the Pension Sub-Committee, of which I am a member, made an attempt to get a few minutes' interview with the Board, and failed. In our negotiations with the Treasury over our pension scheme the Treasury consented to extend the retiring age for women to 65 where necessary to qualify for full pension, provided the Board did not object. The matter was very urgent, as the actuaries were waiting for instructions, so Mr. Mansfield and I went up to the Board meeting on the 6th August, 1912. We met Mr. Ward in the forenoon, and sent him up with our request to Dr. Starke.

23496. Had you written before that to be received on that date?—We had written the day before. Mr. Ward came back very disappointed and told us we had better write our request, as Dr. Starke was unapproachable with any message from us. So we wrote up our request to the Board and waited. The members of the Board began to turn in from 3.30 to 4 o'clock. Mr. Wyse came down and said the agenda was too heavy to allow the Board to see us—Mr. Mansfield's name was on it that day for trial. Mr. Wyse took up our message and after an interval, owing to a misunderstanding of my explanation to him, he brought back an unsatisfactory reply. We asked him to go again, but he demurred, he did not like to interrupt the Board meeting again. In desperation I wrote a note secretly and sent it up into the Boardroom to the Most Rev. Dr. Foley by the hall-porter. In a trace he came down, took up our message, turned back some of the members who were leaving, got the resolution passed, and a copy given to us. But only he was there, and friendly to me personally, our five hours' weary waiting at the doors of Tyrone House begging for a five minutes' interview would have been in vain. The President and Vice-President of the Teachers' Organisation were treated at Tyrone House like beggars asking alms for themselves, instead of like advocates championing the interests of the members of a great Organisation. Mr. Wyse was, personally, most courteous and agreeable, but, of course he could do nothing. Neither could Mr. Ward. He was repulsed that day just like any of the officials who are now under the present regime designated by the unacceptably humiliating term "unofficials."

In striking contrast to the attitude of Dr. Starke towards our Organisation and his Board, is the attitude of all other administrators to whom we have had to turn. We are received by the Viceroy, Chief Secretary, Under Secretary, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and by all the officials connected with their respective offices with the utmost courtesy, kindness, and respect, and in cases of urgency without any formality or red-tape whatever, and their correspondence is marked by the absence of casuistry or equivocation, and strikes a distinctly human note in marked contrast to the cold, repellent formality of the Education Office.

With regard to correspondence with the Education Office, we have actually had to make an appeal to the King to get an answer from the Board. At the time of the Coronation, there was an extra week's vacation given to all children in the United Kingdom. Our Secretary wrote to the Board to know if we could have the extra week added to our

171A September, 1918.]

Miss C. M. Munro examined.

[Continued.]

wrote to the Board to know if we could have the extra week added to our usual holidays, and not getting any reply, our Secretary, Mr. Doyle, wrote to the King, and got the following reply:—

"BUCKINGHAM PALACE,
30th May, 1911.

DEAR SIR,

"I am commanded by the King to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 27th inst., and in reply to inform you that the Commissioners of National Education have decided to allow one week's additional vacation in the National Schools in honour of the Coronation and of the visit of Their Majesties the King and Queen to Ireland.

Yours very faithfully,
CLIVE WIGRAM."

Michael Doyle, Esq.

so I think that is a record. We had actually to apply to the King before we could get a reply from the National Board.

On the 5th June, 1912, Dr. Starkie, at the Technical Congress, made a political speech, in which he attacked the financial clauses of the Government of Ireland Bill before Parliament. In doing so he admitted, actually proclaimed, that he was breaking the law, breaking through the discipline of the Civil Service, of which he is a member. This was the first time he ever raised his voice in public on behalf of the finances of education, and he evidently loomed so largely on his own horizon that he seemed to be the first and only one who had ever done so. He said:—"Having been for the last 13 years so intimately associated with almost any other Irishman with the finances of all grades of education, he conceived it his duty not to deprive his fellow-countrymen of any help he could give in the present crisis." This was peculiarly offensive to the teachers, knowing as they did that for these 13 years the Teachers' Organization had agitated in season and out of season for increased finances for education, interviewing Ministers, holding meetings sending deputations to Westminster, and doing all with no help, but much hindrance and hostility, from Dr. Starkie's Board, and remembering also that though the equivalent grant, which was afterwards lost, was six months' tramping in the balance—from March to September—when Dr. Starkie made his 1902 speech in Belfast, and there, instead of mentioning one word about it, he made a case for its sequestration, by representing the managers and people as indifferent to education, an argument on which Mr. Wyndham afterwards based his sequestration of the grant and its diversion to other purposes. And then the taunt, "The time has come for one who knows how to be outspoken on a question on which the majority—to judge by their silence—are either ignorant or afraid to speak," seemed specially levelled at the teachers. The teachers were never either ignorant or afraid to speak for the 13 years he was silent on this question, and now when it suited him for some reason to come out he thought to drag the teachers after him into the maelstrom of "party-politics," which they are directly prohibited by his Board from touching.

Mr. Mansfield saw through all this, and in Clonmel (15th July, 1912), at a teachers' meeting, he pointed out the contrast between Dr. Starkie's professions and practices, showed that while he was making demands for thousands in public, in private he was upbidding the inspectors, who were depriving their poor down-trodden sets of the miserable little increment of 27 earned by three consecutive years' drudgery in their schools.

23498. It is said that Mr. Wyndham based his case for the diversion of the Development grant upon Dr. Starkie's speech on education in Ireland?—On Dr. Starkie's pronouncement in that Belfast speech that the Managers and people of Ireland were utterly indifferent to the cause of education. These arguments were used by Mr. Wyndham.

It is desirable that there should be no mistake about that fact; that it was based upon that.

23499. The CHAIRMAN.—Did Mr. Wyndham refer to Dr. Starkie at all?—No, but he used the same arguments Dr. Starkie used in Belfast.

23500. That is the indifference of the public to education and that no more money should be spent upon education. Were the people indifferent to education?—He did not mention Dr. Starkie but he used the same argument.

23501. Mr. COFFEY.—Are you acquainted with the circumstances under which that Development grant was first parcelled out?—Yes, mean the secret history of the arrangement in Parliament?

23502. No, I mean its history?—I know that in 1902, England got £1,400,000 for education; Scotland automatically got £311,000, and Ireland's share was £184,000; it was held over and was tramping in the balance when Dr. Starkie made his Belfast speech in 1902.

23503. Do you know how Mr. Wyndham was first got to divert portion of the money from education?—I am afraid I don't know what you are now referring to.

Mr. HENLY.—There is one interesting thing in reference to that grant. In allocating the local grants as they were called to the different counties under the Probate Act, the proportion was fixed at 90, 11, 9, but when Mr. Wyndham came to deal with this grant he said that was not a fair method of distribution, and that it was especially unfair to a poor country like Ireland, and he proposed that the amount should be paid not as under the old Probate grant, in proportion to the sums paid into the Exchequer, but in proportion to population. Under the old ratio, Ireland would only be entitled to £160,000, but when population was taken as the basis, the grant became £184,000. That gave rise to a pretty long agitation that the educational grant for this country should be based upon a population basis.

23504-5. The CHAIRMAN.—Your next heading* is that of Mr. Mansfield's dismissal?—Yes.

Every word Mr. Mansfield uttered on the 15th July in Clonmel was true, and has since been abundantly proved to be true by the evidence before this Committee. Yet it took the dismissal of Mr. Mansfield, the revolt of the teachers, the appointment of a Committee of Inquiry, and six months' laborious, honest work by that Committee before Dr. Starkie could be got to admit that the Tipperary teachers had a grievance, or to promise to look into that grievance, though he knew it before as well as after such a gigantic and far-reaching revolution. I don't know exactly what he said to you, but I know since this inquiry started and since he has given his evidence here, he has been looking into cases and has actually granted redress in some cases.

23506. You are not referring to his words before us?—No! What chance had teachers of any ordinary every day fair play under an administration that will move only under such pressure. Until Dr. Starkie gave evidence before you, he would not admit that the teachers had any grievances.

23507. He said the difficulty was to discover how grievances were to be redressed?—That was his own fault. After Mr. Mansfield's dismissal, the Commissioners during this year gave way to Mr. Birrell's wishes and withdrew the maternity rule in its first form. Also, Mr. Birrell got the Treasury to give the money for restitution to the mothers who were fined, to the number of some hundreds. Also since the promised appointment of this Committee of Inquiry some assistants have got promotion—some threats of dismissal have been revoked—some dismissed teachers reinstated—increments and promotion given freely—and actually some cases of re-inspection and redress. All this could be done while a cannon, in the shape of an inquiry, was pointed at the heads of the Commissioners without Treasury interference, yet for 12 years the blame was always put on the Treasury for the financial wrongs to teachers. Here is the manifesto of the Teachers' Organization calling all communication with the National Board till Mr. Mansfield be re-instated.

* Vide Appendix XII.

Mr. COFFEY.—There is a paragraph that you have not read, but on which I want to ask you a question. Do you apprehend, as is suggested in that paragraph, that if Dr. Starke continues to be Resident Commissioner he will again more severely harass the teachers?

23508. The CHAIRMAN.—I don't think that speculation is very fruitful—I could not hear to think of Dr. Starke having the power over us that he had before. I could not look forward to such a fate for the teachers. It would be worse than Egyptian slavery. I cannot contemplate the possibility of what would happen to the teachers if there is not a complete change.

23509. The CHAIRMAN.—You come now to the C.E.C. manifesto.—The only part of that I want to draw attention to is where we call upon the Government to re-instate Mr. Mansfield, and to grant a full inquiry into the entire treatment and dismissal of Mr. Mansfield. I wish to call special attention to the last paragraph "We pledge ourselves to sustain Mr. Mansfield in his position until he is re-instated, and we refuse, as a Committee, to hold any communication with the National Board, until this matter is satisfactorily settled." These are the relations that exist between us and the Board at present.

23510. Was Mr. Pomeroy actually chief of inspection when he wrote the second of those paragraphs in that manifesto of the C.E.C. He retired in 1912?—No; at the end of 1911, the Tipperary appeals were kept waiting for over five months till he retired, and then Mr. Hynes was sent down. He was ex-chief when he wrote both of those letters.

He signed himself chief of inspection?

23511. Mr. COFFEY.—Perhaps he did not sign himself that way; it may have been put in. He very likely only signed his name, but in the printing and publishing of the letter, the words "Chief of inspection" were put in.—In fact "ex" might have been there, and I may have omitted it. The Manifesto goes on:—"We wish to point out that the action of the National Board is a determined attempt on the very existence of the Irish National Teachers' Organisation, and an attempted death-blow at the right of a representative of an organised body of workers to discuss in a reasonable and fair manner the administration of the Board under which they give service."

"We also desire to point out that the National Board is an unrepresentative body, responsible to no one, neither to the Government which appoints its members, nor to the Irish people who pay, and whose children are educated under the system."

Now, I submit that no system, even the best in the world, could be a success under such relations between the administration and the workers of the department. Each succeeding year was characterised by a fresh violation of vested rights, or a new grievance and renewed causes of hostility and estrangement. At every crisis the door was slammed in the faces of the teachers, and they were again and again refused every "means of access to the Board" till the time for redress was past, and then they had to swallow every previous humiliation, and crawl humbly back again in the vain hope of still prevailing on one who would not be converted.

On the minor and commonplace occasions when Dr. Starke did admit the teachers to an interview he repeatedly told them that he could do nothing but lay their views before the Board. At that time they did not know he exercised the right of veto on what went before the Board, and knowing now, in the light of recent disclosures, that Dr. Starke is the Board as well as the Office Committee, the presumption is strong that the views of deputations never went before the Board at all—at all events, not the smallest concession could ever be traced to one of those deputations to Dr. Starke. In my evidence I laid special stress on the teacher's side of the question. It was my duty as President of the organisation to do this. But you must not infer that the teachers were unkind or neglectful of the children's side of the question. Most of the concessions either asked for or won by our agitation, tended to benefit the

schools and the pupils. For instance, the heating and cleaning grants; the reduction of the average to 50; the saving of ten; the desire to have a voice in the framing of programmes; the demand for free books and equipment, all tend to the good of education as well as of the teachers. In 1903, when we found that a university rate was about to be levied by the Co. Council, we agitated for half the rate for scholarships from primary to secondary schools, and it was only when we were assured that a state grant for the purpose would be forthcoming, that we ceased to demand portion of the rate. This promise materialised in Mr. Birrell's offer of £10,000 for scholarships. The fact that the teachers had to lay such stress on grievances and devote so much time to the struggle for their rights for the last 3 years is entirely due to the mal-administration of the National Board. If in a university one man had supreme control and this man introduced a rule by which the salaries of some existing teachers were considerably reduced, it would inevitably cause dissatisfaction. If he continued year after year to introduce new rules which injured some section of the teachers there, every time and heaped grievances upon grievances year after year upon the teachers, their minds would be so distracted from their duties that the educational interests of that university would be bound to suffer. This has been the teachers' case under the National Board, and while the Scottish Congress of teachers are occupied with academic discussions, we have been incessantly occupied at ours in agitating for a redress of our wrongs. We hold that any rule which by injuring any section of teachers throws the whole country into a violent tumult of agitation and discontent is injurious to education and the promulgation of such a rule is an unsound policy educationally. We hold also that by conference and discussion beforehand compromise and arrangement could be arrived at with regard to new rules and changes by which education would be benefited while at the same time the teachers would not be injured.

The heads of the Teachers' Organisation, who should be the pioneers of educational progress, have been incessantly occupied in the leadership of a delinquent agitation.

The first essential to progress is freedom for the teachers from the incessant distractions caused by a harsh and hostile administration, freedom to devote their minds to educational research, freedom and encouragement to go ahead and distinguish themselves in scholarship and pedagogy, freedom while under the British constitution to speak and not like free citizens of the Empire—then, and not till then, will education in Ireland make any progress, or make up for all that has been lost during the strife and misery of the last unhappy cycle of 13 years. This Committee of Inquiry may suggest reforms in the inspection system, and even in the Board's administration they may plan out the most perfect system in the world, but all will be in vain unless the author of all the past evils is removed from the scene and replaced by a man who, to quote the request of the teacher's organisation in 1890 on the death of Mr. Redington, "is in sympathy and in touch with the teachers who will win and retain their confidence and good will, who will be willing at all times to take into serious consideration the representations placed before him by the representatives of the teaching body."

For the teachers I say they will do their best to make any system a success under a sympathetic administration which will treat them with the kindness, consideration and respect due to their professions, and not as slaves under the "Lengue" of a West-Indian plantation. They did their best in 1890. They went long distances to classes to qualify in the new subjects. Monsignor O'Rourke, in 1893, says—"I have seen female teachers come for miles around to take lessons in laundry cooking and calisthenics from one of the Board's Organisers in the nearest town. They then returned to their respective schools to impart to their pupils what they had just been learning from the Organiser. They taught as I may say from hand to mouth. I have seen

men come from country parts into the nearest town to learn drill, and a few other items of the Revised Programme from the Board's Organiser, and return to their schools to teach what they had just been taught. Those who wanted certificates went to Dublin for a course of instruction on paper-folding, brick-work, wire-work, cardboard, carpentry, &c., and after seven weeks they returned home to initiate their pupils into the mysteries of hand and eye training. For their docility the teachers were treated with insult, distrust, degradation, and dismissal."

23512. The CHAIRMAN.—You said you had a short additional statement to put in?—Yes; the day we discussed Mr. Mansfield's dismissal before you intimated that you would allow me to reopen the case as I should like now to make a statement in his case and to put it in evidence for your consideration.

23513. Yes; we fully intended that?—We ask for Mr. Mansfield's unconditional reinstatement in his school in Cullin. Mr. Mansfield is still the teacher of the Cullin school; he is determined to stay there, and the Manager and people of Cullin are determined to keep him there. The Teacher's Organisation is determined to support him there. In the reply given by Mr. Birrell to our deputation in the House of Commons on the occasion of granting this inquiry, he said "Discontented teachers cannot produce satisfactory results." As long as Mr. Mansfield is allowed to remain a martyr to the National Board's tyranny, every other teacher feels his life and liberty insecure, and there can be no peace or contentment in the land. The agitation for Mr. Mansfield's reinstatement temporarily subsided in the hope, that this Committee may find it possible in the interests of justice, peace and educational progress, to recommend the only reparation that would fully meet his case, and recompense him to some extent for all the torture and worry which he has been made to suffer by the Board's illegal trial by telegraph, and the needless cruelty of their excessive punishment, by ruthless eviction, and the anxiety and suspense he has since undergone. His unconditional reinstatement is the only thing that can atone to him for his sufferings or satisfy the teachers throughout the country. Mr. Mansfield is a moral, temperate, able, hard-working, conscientious and highly efficient teacher. As a teacher, he is not a civil servant and his criticism of an Inspector was nothing compared to the criticism which Dr. Starke, as civil servant, levelled against his masters, the Government. Moreover, Mr. Mansfield's criticism of the Inspector was private and inadvertently became public. Dr. Starke's criticisms were carefully considered, cold-blooded attacks. Dr. Starke's masters forgave him with a private reproof, and asked for no apology or reparation, but he, like the unforgiving servant, cropped down upon his subject, held on him the mockery of a trial by telegraph, and the Board sentenced him in secret inquisition to be cast out without money or remorse.

23514. Mr. COFFEY.—How do you know Dr. Starke had not to make an apology to the Government?—He was not asked to make any public apology. Mr. Birrell said in the House of Commons that he had reproved him.

23515. The CHAIRMAN.—Did he say that publicly?—Yes.

23516. I never saw that?—It appeared on the 31st October, when speaking on the Mansfield case, he said he reproved Dr. Starke for his utterances, and that he disapproved of them. Mr. Mansfield broke no rule of either the published or secret code. Even if there was a rule which there was not, forbidding a teacher to name a harsh Inspector, the time had come when obedience ceased to be a virtue. All constitutional means had been tried and failed. I stand by the Ten Commandments, and no commandment enjoins obedience to harsh, arbitrary, and cruel taskmasters. We are to obey, the Gospel says, in conscience, and justice; and a great English Judge once said "Rebellion to tyrants is obedience to God." Mr. Mansfield could not, in obedience to the Commissioners, repudiate what he knew to be true, though made public by mistake. Neither could he

apologise to a man he knew to be harsh and dictatorial, and sheltered in his harshness by the Board. The teachers, as far as justice goes, are outside the British Constitution. The Board, after what they called the "fullest investigation," denied the teachers all redress to their individual and collective appeals. Parliament declares it has no power to interfere, appeals that the Board is privileged by Charter, and beyond the reach of Common Law. This is the condition the teachers are in, kicked from Board to Parliament, from Parliament to Treasury, and from Treasury back to Board. And when a man rises up against such a state of intolerable evilism, he is asked to repudiate what he said privately, what he said terrified by the revelations of a Chief Inspector, what has since been proved to be true, in other words, he is asked to utter a falsehood in the shape of an apology.

23517. The CHAIRMAN.—What sort of a meeting was it at which Mr. Mansfield made his speech?—It was a public meeting of teachers, but he asked the reporters not to take down what he said about the Inspector, and he wrote a summary of what he said himself.

23518. They had taken notes of what he did say?—One of the reporters seems to have misunderstood his request and took down what he did say, and published it as the "Chronicle." It is the Commissioners who should be arraigned, and should apologise to the teachers for the denial of justice, and the wrongs inflicted on them, wrongs which would continue in perpetuity and which would never have been acknowledged were it not for this inquiry. Even when Mr. Mansfield's school report was raised by the Chief Inspector from "good" to "very good," he never received the slightest intimation of it. As for the tone of Mr. Mansfield's letters, the circumstances, both of the teachers' case and the method of his own trial, justified him. Furthermore, their tone was far more reasonable and far less caustic than the tone of Dr. Starke's repeated utterances with regard to his superiors and to the Managers and to the teachers and to the whole Irish nation. When Dr. Starke, the head of the Department, so largely couched his attacks in the language of ridicule, it is natural that he should be repelled to in the same terms by the victims. Taking all the circumstances into account, we hold Mr. Mansfield's action excusable; we look upon his treatment as unjustifiable, and we could agree to no recommendation that would even by implication represent him as in any degree at fault. The demand of the organisation, and this is a demand on which there will be no compromise, is for his unconditional reinstatement in Cullin school. As President of the organisation to put these views of the organisation before you for your consideration. Now I wish to allude to one or two other things. On the first day that I gave my evidence, I mentioned about investigations on anonymous reports. I referred to one case, and one member of the Committee asked me to hand in some other instances of investigation upon anonymous reports.

23519. The CHAIRMAN.—Would you give us one of them?—Yes. In October, 1904, Mr. Baunton held an investigation upon an anonymous report at Newton School, Tipperary. Mr. Dehority, the Principal, had been Secretary of a Co-operative Society which he helped to found. He had just resigned the Secretaryship. He was reported to the Board as having attended the meeting of the Society at a time when he had severed his connection with it. Mr. Baunton, on entering the school, rushed to the books to see if Rolls had been marked for the day. The teacher, of course, had not been out of the school during school hours.

23520. That was upon an anonymous charge?—Yes; the investigation was held upon an anonymous charge. About the same time Mr. J. R. Bradshaw, Cappamore, was reported to the Education Office for acting as Secretary to a similar Society. His reports had always been of a very high order, and he had just received an increment. The help he gave the farmers locally was given after school hours, as meetings were always held in the evening. In this

17th September, 1913.]

Miss C. M. Mason examined.

[Continued.]

case also, Mr. Bannon investigated, and the anonymous letter was produced on the inquiry. You asked for examples, and I have others if you require them.

23521. That will be sufficient?—Mr. Connelley, Assistant in Wicklow Boys' school, was the subject of an anonymous attack. The Board investigated it, and the teacher's dismissal followed; the Local Inspectors on several occasions held inquiries into anonymous charges regarding the teachers in the Boys school, Galbally, Tipperary.

23522. In all those cases you say the information was given in anonymous letters?—Yes; and the anonymous letter was produced as one inquiry. Now I was asked for instances of reports that were delayed from one to eleven months.

23523. We heard of one that was delayed eleven months?—I give you the following as some of the instances of delay. Mr. P. Campbell, Kilderry N. 8., Kilmallock, Co. Cavan, Report delayed 8 months, from March, 1913, to September, 1913; Mr. Fenshighty, Ardahan, Co. Kerry, Report delayed 8 months, from February to October; Mr. McCarthy, C. E. C. Representative, Co. Cork, Inspection in October, 1912, and August, 1913. Neither Report received yet. Yesterday a question arose about the consideration of salaries in 1900, and I have consulted Mr. Mansfield as he has special knowledge, and he explained that in case of a change from one school to another, or in case of the change of teachers, the teacher retained his class salary, that the result fees of the school for the previous three years were averaged, so if one teacher was in a school for the years 1898 and 1899, and another teacher came to the school in 1900, the one year he spent in that school with the two years of his predecessor's result fees would be averaged.

Mr. HANLY.—Perhaps you are referring, Miss Mahon, to a teacher who is only one year in the service.

23524. Sir HERALD WILKINSON.—In that case that is how it would be done. In a particular case it would be an advantage to the teacher that he should have a 3 years' average because he was in a school with a certain income and he was induced to change into another school which in the event did not produce the same income—at first he was graded upon the income for the year in which he was at that school which was the final of the 3 years, and it was afterwards allowed that the average to be taken was not the average during the 3 years of this present school but two years of the time which he had been in the school in which he had obtained the higher income?—In that case it worked out to his advantage.

23525. Mr. COFFEY.—Do you happen to know the case of Mr. CULLEN from Dungannon district, because he showed me a tabular statement as to how it worked out, and it seemed to me that he had a very substantial case of complaint. He was appointed in 1909 Principal of that school, and his salary was based upon result fees of the 3 years before, and that included one year in which the school was only in operation for some months, and he never got redress?—I know a similar case with a very low average where the predecessor of the teacher was in defective health. The teacher, Mr. Nash, went into that school in the 3rd of the three years, and he worked up the school and his result for the one year was nearly double that of his predecessor for the two years, but the two years of his predecessor and his one year were averaged for salary.

23526. Sir HERALD WILKINSON.—That is a hardship. It is clear that the system gives advantage to one, and disadvantage to another?—There is another document which I have been asked to put in as showing the effect of buildings on increments and promotion. It is a statement signed by a teacher named Patrick Traynor, of Ballymartin N. 8. Mr. Traynor says "Dr. Starcke, Resident Commissioner, visited Ballymartin N. 8., on the 7th September, 1909. He remained half-an-hour, signed his name in the daily Report Book, but left no report. He examined a few of the pupils' exercises, and read over the annual reports. He arrived when the pupils were going to recreation, consequently he did not examine. During the time of his visit, he complained of the defective nature of the infant's desks, of the state of the interior walls of

the school-house—that they require to be painted; of the paint on the ceiling and partitions, and that it was too dark; of the want of creeps on the exterior walls. I said to him that creeps were dear, he said I could get good ones for 6d., and finished by saying "That would not cost you much, would it?" Now I firmly believed then that the state of the school buildings, apart from its cleanliness, &c., was to be taken into consideration by the Inspector when awarding the merit marks. Consequently new infant desks of a more suitable character were supplied, and the exterior walls were painted in October, 1909; the Manager paid for these improvements. On the 26th November, 1909, Mr. Rogers, District Inspector, visited for annual report. After his inspection, he told me that he was very glad that the school-house and furniture had been improved since the time of Dr. Starcke's visit, for that Dr. Starcke had sent him a list of schools which were marked too high by him for annual report, and that Ballymartin N. 8. was on the list. I asked on what grounds did Dr. Starcke base his opinion. Mr. Rogers said in reply that it was on account of the defective nature of the furniture and the school-house."

23527. Mr. HANLY.—That seems to show two things; first that the building seems to have been taken into account, and, second, that Dr. Starcke appears to be expressing his opinion with regard to the marking of the Inspectors?—It is a serious document and is signed by the teacher. That is one document with regard to the effect of the buildings.

Mr. COFFEY.—That is one important point, but there is the more important point that Dr. Starcke was interfering with the judgment of the Inspector.

The CHAIRMAN.—He said the school was over-marked.

23528. Mr. COFFEY.—He gave a list of schools that were over-marked?—I have another from Joseph O'Neill, of Newry, who says that the Senior Inspector informed him he would never get special promotion owing to the bad building.

23529. The CHAIRMAN.—I think you have some statement from teachers who did not appear before us?—Yes; there are several members of our executive representing many counties, and perhaps thousands of teachers, and they have collected evidence in their districts, and they have drawn up statements upon this evidence which they had intended to bring before you. We put the list before them last Saturday that you could not hear any more witnesses, and we put some considerations before them that helped to reconcile them to that fact notwithstanding their disappointment.

23530. Can you put these statements before us in any form that would help us?—I would suggest that you should take those statements at least of the Members of the Central Executive Committee who, on account of your decision, will not be here personally to give this evidence.

23531. Are these arranged according to topics as in Mr. Mansfield's letter?—Yes; the most important statement is one from Mr. Numan, who represents 5,000 Assistant Teachers. It is specially important, because no special Representative of the Assistants has been heard before the Committee. The next in importance is from Mr. McGrath, the representative of the West of Ireland who deals with the Bilingual and Irish question. Then there is Mr. Fenshighty, Representative of the South of Ireland. Then, Mr. Ramsey furnished me with his statement. Then there is the statement of Mr. O'Connell, which deals especially with 32 (a) and 127 (b), and there is the statement of Mr. Judge on Paper Promoted Teachers. These are all important statements by representative teachers.

23532. They represent certain points of view, each of them?—Some are very important points, and I would ask to have them all printed in the appendix.

23533. If you give them on your own responsibility and vouch for them?—Yes; the cases are within the knowledge of those representative teachers, and they are ready to prove every statement made as they expected to be called as witnesses.

23534. What I want to know is on your responsibility, as President of the Association, would you be willing to vouch for their accuracy?—Oh, certainly.

* Vide Appendix.

23533. I think in these circumstances we may print them?—Having made that concession, I have a further request to make. I was asked to put before you the fact that out of the 1,300 cases, we have picked out a certain number containing some important point and summarised them, and I want to know will you accept the summaries in these cases.

23534-7. I think that is rather a different thing?—I know you have done a great deal, but I was asked to put this matter before you, to see if you could print these also.

23538. The CHAIRMAN.—I am very much afraid we can hardly accept that as evidence to go into our

Book. These are summaries made by individual persons of evidence we have not seen. The summaries, no doubt, might be accurate, but I think we should incur considerable responsibility in printing them?—There is this other representative teacher who represents the north-western districts of Sligo, Carran, and Mayo. Mr. McGowan and he was to have made a summary in expectation of giving evidence, but he has been ill for some time, and was not able to attend our meeting.

That is a summary that must stand or fall with the other summaries.

Mr. MANSFIELD recalled, and further examined.

23539. The CHAIRMAN.—I understand you wish to say that owing to the difficulty in being asked to give your evidence earlier than you anticipated, you experienced some disadvantage?—Yes, some disadvantage.

23540. And did not bring forward everything in the shape you wished to?—That is so.

23541. You propose to put in a new statement* which introduces no new matter, but will merely develop the evidence you have already given?—Yes.

23542. Because we could hardly admit it if it in any way introduced new matter?—No new matter will be introduced.

23543. The Committee think on the whole they would be justified in printing it on these terms. You give an assurance that there is no new matter in it and that it is merely a development of the evidence you have already given?—That is so.

23544. Sir HERMAN WILKINSON.—I understand you to say you were not in a position to prepare a complete précis of your evidence, and that you were taken at a disadvantage in being called before your time, and you want now to put in a fuller and clearer précis covering the whole ground?—That is so. Of course we hoped that a large number of witnesses would be summoned, and I had to see to the arrangements, and that occupied an amount of my time, and the day that I came here to give evidence was one of the days on which I intended to prepare my statement.

23545. The CHAIRMAN.—Yes; that was the day that Mr. MacSweeney was to be examined, but owing to some circumstance he was not able to attend, and you very kindly took his place without having your précis fully prepared?—Yes; and I am very much obliged to the Committee for letting me put in the statement I have indicated.

* Vide Appendix LIII.

APPENDICES.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
APPENDIX XLV.— Pamphlet—Belfast National Teachers' Organisation—Inspection and Reports on National Schools (<i>Handed in by Mr. C. H. Todd, Principal, Ballymacarrett Road N.S., Belfast.</i>)	330
APPENDIX XLVI.— Pamphlet—Belfast Teachers' Rejoinders to Inspectors' Observations (<i>Handed in by Mr. C. H. Todd, Principal, Ballymacarrett Road N.S., Belfast.</i>)	338
APPENDIX XLVII.— Pamphlet—List of Merit Marks, Belfast (<i>Handed in by Mr. C. H. Todd, Principal, Ballymacarrett Road N.S., Belfast.</i>)	347
APPENDIX XLVIII.— Mr. Homan's Letter to Mr. Todd (<i>Handed in by Mr. C. H. Todd, Principal, Ballymacarrett Road N.S., Belfast.</i>)	373
APPENDIX XLIX.— Letter from Board of National Education to Mr. Knight (<i>Handed in by Mr. C. H. Todd, Principal, Ballymacarrett Road N.S., Belfast.</i>)	372
APPENDIX L.— Circular as to Corporal Punishment (<i>Handed in by Mr. D. Elliott, B.A., Treasurer, Irish National Teachers' Organisation.</i>)	373
APPENDIX LI.— Letter of Manager re Mr. Jamison, and Letter's Rejoinder (<i>Handed in by Mr. T. Jamison, B.A., Principal, Madral Street N.S., Belfast.</i>)	372
APPENDIX LII.— Statement of Evidence tendered on behalf of the Irish National Teachers' Organisation. (<i>Handed in by Miss C. M. Mahon, President, I.N.T.O.</i>)	370
APPENDIX LIII.— Returns of dates of certain meetings of the Board of National Education. (<i>Handed in by Major Deane, Commissioner of National Education</i>)	419
APPENDIX LIV.— Copy of letter from Very Rev. Canon O'Neill, D.D., to the Commissioners of National Education. (<i>Handed in by Mr. E. Mansfield, Secretary, I.N.T.O.</i>)	419
APPENDIX LV.— Circular as to Penalties for Inefficiency. (<i>Handed in by Miss C. M. Mahon, President, I.N.T.O.</i>)	410
APPENDIX LVI.— Statement furnished by Mr. T. J. Numan. (<i>Handed in by Miss C. M. Mahon, President, I.N.T.O.</i>)	411
APPENDIX LVII.— Paper-promotion—statement and table furnished by Mr. R. Judge. (<i>Handed in by Miss C. M. Mahon, President, I.N.T.O.</i>)	415
APPENDIX LVIII.— Statement furnished by Mr. T. J. O'Connell. (<i>Handed in by Miss C. M. Mahon, President, I.N.T.O.</i>)	420
APPENDIX LIX.— Statement furnished by Mr. J. M. Fenaghty. (<i>Handed in by Miss C. M. Mahon, President, I.N.T.O.</i>)	425
APPENDIX LX.— Table of Merit Marks—furnished by Mr. G. Ramsay. (<i>Handed in by Miss C. M. Mahon, President, I.N.T.O.</i>)	430
APPENDIX LXI.— Statement furnished by Mr. J. McGrath, B.A. (<i>Handed in by Miss C. M. Mahon, President, I.N.T.O.</i>)	433
APPENDIX LXII.— Report of deposition to the Resident Commissioner as to Rule 127 (b). (<i>Handed in by Miss C. M. Mahon, President, I.N.T.O.</i>)	434
APPENDIX LXIII.— Statement furnished by Mr. E. Mansfield, Secretary, I.N.T.O.	435
APPENDIX LXIV.— Table of Merit Marks—furnished by Mr. J. McGrath, B.A. (<i>Handed in by Miss C. M. Mahon, President, I.N.T.O.</i>)	447
APPENDIX LXV.— Extract from pamphlet entitled "Inspection of Schools and Promotion of Teachers. Exposure of Present System." (<i>Handed in by Mr. C. H. Todd, Principal, Ballymacarrett Road N.S., Belfast.</i>)	454

APPENDIX XLV.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE BOARD OF NATIONAL EDUCATION AND THE BELFAST TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION.

(Handed in by Mr. C. H. Todd, Principal, Ballymacarrett Road N.S., Belfast.)

The following correspondence between the Belfast Teachers' Association and the Education Office, Dublin, which was carried on prior to the presentation of the Memorial from the Belfast group of Inspection Districts, sheds a brilliant light upon the methods of Irish Education officials in dealing with teachers, who are the most important factors in Elementary as in all other branches of Education.

Particular attention may be directed to the refusal of the Resident Commissioner, on 24th October, 1910, to alter the form of drawing up the "Minute of Report" on Schools and Teachers an alteration which was asked for to insure the impossibility of teachers suffering either in pocket or credit from defects in the School-building or its equipment. Also to his refusal on 4th November, 1910, speaking for the Education Commissioners, "to give formal public expression" to "precise rules" which would indicate the conditions that teachers must fulfil before they could obtain either increment or promotion.

The Commissioners' sense of justice is very clearly pictured in their Secretary's letter of November 14, 1911. They had circulated amongst the Inspectors the views held by the teachers presenting the Memorial regarding the influence on education of the present methods of inspection and the defects in the performance of inspectional duties, but would not allow the teachers to learn the observations made by these same Inspectors on the methods of teaching of the deputations. The Inspectors were permitted to contest the evidence given by the deputations, but it was not to be thought of that the latter should know the nature of the rebutting and other statements made by the Inspectors or be given an opportunity to refute charges which in some cases were false.

In the letter of 26th January, 1912, the Commissioners state that they are "ready at all times to investigate fully charges brought against Inspectors in the regular and prescribed manner." Now, teachers do not look upon an appeal for re-inspection as necessarily a charge against the Inspector. A fair court of appeal is the claimant needs, but those who are acquainted with appeals for re-inspection know in how few instances the "Office" grants such revision, while Mr. Philip Ward's statement informs us how often these appeals reached the Commissioners themselves, viz., not once between September, 1910, and November, 1912. Inspection has not yet become such an exact science, that it is impossible for even one mistake to be made in the 16,000 inspections in 8,000 Schools which were conducted within these two years.

The widespread feeling of dissatisfaction throughout Ireland, coupled with the manner in which the Reports on many good Schools are now in alternate years from "Very Good" to "Fair," and back to "Good" or "Very Good," is the dominant note proving the urgency for a remedy if education is to make the advance that all so wish, but which is absolutely retarded, if not altogether stopped by the present discontent amongst teachers.

RESOLUTION OF THE BELFAST TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION, FORWARDED 7TH JULY, 1910, TO THE RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, W. J. M. STARKIE, Esq., LIFT.D., EDUCATION OFFICE, DUBLIN:—

"That we condemn in the strongest possible manner the practice of Inspectors taking into account in any way the character of the School buildings when estimating the Educational progress of the School, as the Standard of Education is totally distinct from the School-house for which the teacher is not responsible.

"Signed on behalf of Association,

T. W. WILSON, President.
J. T. M'GILL, } Hon. Secs.
W. KNIGHT, }

LETTER RECEIVED FROM A. N. B. WYSE, Esq.

Office of National Education,
Dublin, July 11th, 1910.

DEAR SIR—I am requested by the Resident Commissioner to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 7th inst., and the copy of the resolution of the Belfast National Teachers' Association enclosed therewith. I am instructed to say that your Association appears to be under a misapprehension with regard to the object and effect of the Inspectors' practice referred to. Inspectors are enjoined to take into account the character of the school building when classifying the school in their general reports, in order that a just estimate may be arrived at with respect to the value of the teacher's work. Were the character of the school premises not considered by the inspector when assigning the mark, a teacher, whose work, though "Excellent" in every respect, which depended on himself, yet did not, owing to an unsatisfactory building, produce a commensurate result, might find his school classified as merely "Good," because the educational progress of the pupils, considered apart from the conditions under which the work was done, was not up to an "Excellent" standard.

Were the proposals in your resolution adopted, teachers working under unfavourable conditions might find themselves heavily penalised—a result which I can scarcely suppose to be one of the objects of your Association.—Yours faithfully,

A. N. BONAPARTE WYSE.

Mr. J. T. M'GILL,
1A Rosbank Street,
Belfast.

Whitehall Buildings, Ann Street,
Belfast, 12th Sept., 1910.

DEAR SIR—The communication of 11th July from Mr. A. N. B. Wyse, in response to our Resolution of 7th July, has been considered by our Association, and in reply thereto, we are instructed to inform you that our experience of the practice of Inspectors has invariably been that they take into account the character of the School buildings, furniture, and apparatus, in estimating the Standard of efficiency of the school work, to the detriment of the Staff.

Mr. Wyse says:—"Inspectors are enjoined to take into account the character of the School buildings when classifying the school in their General Reports in order that a just estimate may be arrived at with respect to the value of the teacher's work." We contend that Inspectors do not seem to have rightly apprehended the spirit of the instructions, for instances have occurred, when the Inspector plainly told the teacher that the poor character of the building prevented him awarding the mark, which under happier conditions, the teacher's work deserved. We believe under these circumstances, it is necessary that fresh instructions be issued to Inspectors, plainly stating that all reports on the buildings, &c., for the information of the Manager, who presumably is responsible, should be furnished quite apart from the Report on the work of the teacher, and should not adversely affect the promotion or increment of the teacher.—We are, dear Sir, Your obedient servants,

T. W. WILSON, President.
J. T. M'GILL, } Hon. Secs.
Wm. KNIGHT, }

W. J. M. Starkie, Esq., M.A., Litt.D.,
Resident Commissioner of National Education,
Dublin.

Office of N. Education,
October 24th, 1910.

DEAR SIR—I am requested by the Resident Commissioner to refer to your letter of the 7th ult., and previous correspondence regarding the Inspectors'.

practice when assigning the classification marks to a School in the General Report, and to say that your letter and the letter dated 17th ult., of the Belfast Teachers' Association which accompanied it have been considered.

The Resident Commissioner sees no reason to alter the present practice of drawing up and issuing the "Minutes" to the Managers and teachers, as it is quite clear that the mark assigned to the School has reference to the progress of the pupils and efficiency of the teaching and not to the state of repair or suitability of the School building. There is no good reason for believing that any ambiguity has been caused by the form of the report.

Careful enquiries have been made with regard to the statement that Inspectors have lowered the mark on the School owing to the poor character of the building and equipment, and the Resident Commissioner is satisfied that this is not the case. On the contrary it is the custom of the Inspectors to award more favourable marks to the Schools than the absolute work done by the teachers would warrant when they see the house, furniture, or apparatus to be of an inferior character. If instances of a different kind are known to the teachers, the Resident Commissioner will be glad to be furnished with the particulars and will have the matter enquired into.—I am, Dear Sir, Yours faithfully,

A. N. BONAPARTE WISE.

Mr. J. T. McGILL.

55, Rosemount Gardens,
Belfast, 14th Nov., 1910.

DEAR SIR—At a meeting of the Belfast Teachers' Association, held on Saturday, 12th inst., I was asked to write you in order to ascertain the following information:—

(a) The "Mark" on Minute showing the "General condition of School" which is necessary to obtain increment in each grade.

(b) The "Mark" on Minute necessary to obtain promotion to second grade, second of first grade, and first of first grade, respectively;

(c) The personal "Mark" on efficiency of teacher necessary to secure—(1) increment in each grade, and (2) promotion from grade to grade.

You will doubtless see that it is but fair that workers should know fully the conditions under which they serve.—I am, dear sir, yours faithfully,

WM. KNIGHT.

W. J. M. Starke, Esq., Litt.D.,
Resident Commissioner of National Education

November 24th, 1910.

DEAR SIR—In reply to your letter to the Resident Commissioner of 14th inst., in which you request to be informed of the character of the reports required to warrant the awards of increments and promotion to teachers in the various grades, I am requested to say that the Commissioners do not consider it desirable to give formal public expression to any more precise rules in these matters, than are to be found in Chap. VIII. of the Code.—I am, dear sir, yours faithfully,

A. N. BONAPARTE WISE.

Mr. Wm. Knight,
55, Rosemount Gardens.

Belfast Teachers' Association,
Whitehall Buildings, ANN STREET,
Belfast, 21st January, 1911.

DEAR SIR—Your letter of the 24th October, in reply to our communication of 13th September, has been submitted to this Association, and in reply we are instructed to state that the members are very much gratified to learn that the mark assigned in the School "Minute" is for the future to be understood as having reference to the progress of the pupils and efficiency of the teaching staff, and not to the state of repair or suitability of the School building.

You will recognise that a very important change was made in the wording of the "Minute" in the year 1904, when the readings became:—(1) "General

condition of School," (2) "Inspector's Minute upon the results of the inspection of the School."

Prior to the year (1904) the readings were:—(1) "Progress of pupils," (2) "Proficiency of pupils in each subject."

Again in the Board's Rules for 1906-10, received by the teachers in August, 1906, the Managers are told for the first time: "That it is their duty to make every School comfortable by having it properly furnished, lighted, cleaned, and ventilated, and adequately heated in the cold weather" (see Rule 35a); and the teachers, therefore, concluded that prior to that date, Inspectors considered these items when drawing up their reports on the Schools.

They (the teachers) were confirmed in this belief by the fact that there was a sub-head in the "Minute" specially dealing with the "Progress of the pupils," so that the Inspector's opinion of the state of the School building and equipment could be included in the general heading alone, as there was no special section referring to these subjects.

In view of these facts, our Association hopes that you will consider the expediency of having separate sections in the "Minute" dealing with (a) the School building, and (b) the efficiency of the teaching staff.—We are, dear sir, your obedient servants,

(Signed), JOSEPH T. M'GILL,
WM. KNIGHT,
THOMAS JACKSON, } Secs.

W. J. Starke, Esq., M.A., Litt.D.,
Resident Commissioner, N.E.,
Ireland.

Office of National Education,
23th January, 1911.

DEAR SIR—I am requested by the Resident Commissioner to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 21st inst., containing a letter of the Belfast Teachers' Association in reply to my letter of the 24th October last.

The Resident Commissioner does not see any necessity, as I have already stated, to make any alteration in the form of the report issued to the National Schools. It is not the case that any essential change was made in this form in 1904. The headings "Progress of pupils" and "Proficiency of pupils in each subject" were merely combined into the expression "General condition of the School," and there was no intention of making any alteration in the manner in which the Inspector should assign the mark.

In regard to your statement that the Board's Rules for last year contained for the first time an injunction to Managers to make every school comfortable by having it properly furnished, &c., you will find that this regulation denoted merely an alteration in the degree of emphasis attached to this matter, which was dealt with under Rule 35 of the Code for several years prior to last year.—I am, dear sir, yours faithfully,

(Signed), A. N. BONAPARTE WISE.

Mr. Joseph T. M'GILL,
1A, ROEBUNK STREET,
Belfast.

Whitehall Buildings, ANN STREET,
Belfast, 24th Nov., 1910.

GENTLEMEN—We are requested by our Association to make application for the reception by the Commissioners of National Education of a deputation in support of the accompanying memorial.

It is felt that an interview by deputation is necessary to place before the Commissioners of National Education the facts upon which the teachers rely to demonstrate the existence of grievances which press very seriously on many of them, and the strongest hopes are held that the Commissioners, having the best interests of Irish Education at heart, will be graciously pleased to grant the present request.—We are, gentlemen, your obedient servants,

J. T. M'GILL, } Hon.
WM. KNIGHT, } Secs.

The Secretaries,
Office of National Education,
Dublin.

L. 3423/10c.

Office of National Education.
Dublin, 28th December, 1910.

GENTLEMEN—Referring to your letter of the 28th ultimo, I am directed to inform you that it is not the practice of the Commissioners of National Education to receive deputations, but the Resident Commissioner would be able to receive a small deputation from your Association at a future date.—I am, gentlemen, your obedient servant,

P. E. LEHMAN,
Secretary.

Mr. J. T. McGILL, } Local Hon.
Mr. Wm. Knight, } Secretaries,
Belfast Teachers' Association.

L. 3423/10c.

Whitehall Buildings, Ann Street,
Belfast, 19th December, 1910.

GENTLEMEN—In reply to your favour of the 6th inst., I am instructed to say that this Association regrets that the Commissioners of National Education do not receive deputations, but is pleased to learn that the Resident Commissioner can receive our deputation.

Kindly ascertain what date, if possible after the Christmas holidays, would suit Dr. Starke.—I am, gentlemen, your obedient servant,

WM. KNIGHT.

The Secretaries,
Office of National Education.Office of National Education,
Dublin, 23rd December, 1910.

SIR—Referring to your letter of the 19th instant and previous correspondence, I am directed to inform you that before the Resident Commissioner fixes a date on which he would be prepared to receive the deputation from the Belfast Teachers' Association, he desires to have a full memorandum submitted to him of the facts on which the teachers rely for the demonstration of the existence of the grievances mentioned in their memorial, together with particulars of any special cases of grievance which they propose to bring under his notice. I am accordingly to request that a comprehensive statement may be furnished for the consideration of the Resident Commissioner as soon as possible.—I am, sir, your obedient servant,

P. E. LEHMAN,
Secretary.

Mr. Wm. Knight,
Hon. Secretary,
Belfast Teachers' Association.

Whitehall Buildings, Ann Street,
Belfast, 3rd January, 1911.

GENTLEMEN—In reply to your letter of the 23rd ult., I was instructed yesterday to forward for the consideration of the Resident Commissioner, data upon which the teachers base their memorial.

(1) Widespread complaint of the teachers as proved by the fact that the memorial has been signed by the large number of 238 teachers of 111 Schools in which the "Mark" awarded by the Inspectors has been lowered.

(2) Additional cases of declension in report are known but, for various reasons, the teachers of the Schools were unwilling to sign the memorial.

(3) An upward trend in the proficiency of the Schools in the Belfast circuits is revealed by the tone of the reports of the Inspectors contained in the Appendix, Section 1, for each year from 1901 to 1908 (inclusive). These "General Reports" on the state of National Education by Inspectors are found in the Commissioners' Reports on the following pages—(Appendix Section 1):—

Year 1901	..	Pages	79-81
" 1902	..	Page	132
" 1903	..	Pages	138-140
" 1904	..	"	78-79
" 1905	..	"	154-158
" 1906	..	"	29-30
" 1907	..	"	135 & 142
" 1908	..	"	31-33

(4) While the statistics published annually, showing the classification of Schools inspected each year, exhibit a marked improvement in the percentage of "Excellent," "Very Good," and "Good" Reports, the contrary holds as regards the Schools in the Belfast circuits, the figures of which are quite at variance with the improved proficiency reported under (3).

These Statistics are in the Annual Reports of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, and will be found on the following pages for the years, as under:—

Year 1901	..	Page	40
" 1902	..	"	38
" 1905	..	"	9
" 1907	..	"	35
" 1908	..	"	34
" 1909	..	"	34

I am, Gentlemen,

Your obedient servant,

WILLIAM KNIGHT,
Hon. Secretary.The Secretaries
Office of National Education.

L. 20/1011c.

Office of National Education,
Dublin, 4th January, 1911.

SIR—I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 3rd instant relative to the data on which the Belfast Teachers base their memorial, and I am to state that the Resident Commissioner observes that no particular cases of teachers or schools are referred to in your letter, and that he considers a deputation to him would be without advantage unless he is supplied beforehand with the details of at least twenty cases in which it is alleged the records of the teachers have been unduly lowered.—I am, sir, your obedient servant,

P. E. LEHMAN,
Secretary.

Mr. Wm. Knight,
Hon. Secretary,
Belfast Teachers' Association.

Whitehall Buildings, Ann Street,
Belfast, 12th January, 1911.

GENTLEMEN—In reply to your letter of the 4th inst., wherein the Resident Commissioner requests our Association to supply him with the details of at least twenty cases in which it is alleged the records of the teachers have been unduly lowered, I am instructed to forward the complete list of the Schools in which the signatures to the memorial teach.

Our Association has not the complete details of all these cases, but doubtless the official records in the Education Office will supply the information required in each case.

Herewith please find list of 111 Schools.—I am, gentlemen, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM KNIGHT,
Hon. Secretary.The Secretaries,
Office of National Education.Office of National Education,
Dublin, 18th January, 1911.

SIR—With reference to your letter of the 12th instant and previous correspondence relative to the proposed deputation to the Resident Commissioner from the Belfast Teachers' Association, I am directed to point out that instead of furnishing, as requested on the 4th instant details of cases in which it is alleged that the records of the teachers have been unduly lowered, you now send a list which merely contains the names and the roll numbers of 111 Schools in which the teachers who signed the memorial to the Board are employed. Obviously all these cases could not be dealt with at one interview. Fuller particulars, too, are requisite concerning any cases

that are to be discussed. It is suggested, therefore, that the memorialists should select twenty or so, of the cases which they deem the strongest. In the event of their doing so, it will be necessary to supply with the list, the following particulars of each of the cases selected:—

- (a) Names of Teachers who appeal.
- (b) Dates of reports to which exception is taken.
- (c) Names of Inspectors who furnished reports.
- (d) Points in reports to which exception is taken.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

P. E. LEHMAN,

Secretary.

Mr. W. Knight,

Hon. Secretary,

Belfast Teachers' Association.

Whitehall Buildings, Ann Street,
Belfast, 23rd January, 1911.

GENTLEMEN—The Committee of the Belfast Teachers' Association have directed me to forward the following reply to your letter of the 18th inst.:

On the 23rd ult., you asked for facts upon which our memorial is founded, and our Secretary, on 3rd January, referred you to certain pages in the Commissioners' Reports as part of the proofs we desired to lay before you.

You next, on the 4th inst., asked for specific cases, and our Secretary on 12th inst., sent you a list of 111 Schools, the teachers of which complain that their reports have been unduly lowered.

In your letter of the 18th inst., you ask, under four heads for details of twenty of the strongest of these cases. We have not the reports of these Schools, and therefore, cannot select the strongest cases, but even if we could, it would be unfair to the remaining teachers who have an equal claim to consideration.

Your request for particular cases, seems to be made under misapprehension of the aim of our memorial. We consider that its strength lies not so much in the unfitness in individual cases, as in the widespread reduction of reports to which it refers. In support of our contention, we ask you to receive a deputation of 7 teachers, of whom the first five have signed the memorial. Each of these 5 will be able to give you particulars of his own case.

We desire that memorialists be permitted to present their case in this way, and be not compelled to rest it on a limited number of concrete examples, a course which they never intended to adopt.

The following are the names and addresses of the teachers selected to wait on you:—

Messrs. C. H. TODD ..	Ballymacarrett Road N.S., Belfast.
W. C. BOYD ..	Ravenscroft Avenue N.S., Belfast.
J. E. LAMMOCK ..	St. James's N.S., Belfast.
JAMES TURLEY ..	Star of the Sea N.S., Belfast.
T. R. MCCUGRAGH ..	Hidden N.S., Lishara.
J. M. THOMSON ..	Boa Memorial N.S., Belfast.
WM. KNIGHT ..	Edgmont Street N.S., Belfast.

The Committee of the Association trust that you will be able to ascertain from the Resident Commissioner the day and hour which would be most convenient for him to receive our deputation.

I am, Gentlemen,

Your obedient servant,

WM. KNIGHT,

Hon. Secretary.

The Secretaries,
Office of National Education.

Office of National Education,
Dublin, 23rd January, 1911.

SIR—Referring to your letter of the 23rd instant, I am directed to inform you that the Resident Commissioner will be prepared to receive the teachers named as a deputation from the Belfast Association, on Monday, 6th February, at 3.30 p.m. in this Office.

The Resident Commissioner will consider the statements of their own cases, which Messrs. Todd, Boyd, Lammo, Turley, and McCullagh are prepared to make, and also any other specific cases, not exceeding twenty, the particulars of which may be sent to him before the 6th proximo.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

P. E. LEHMAN,
Secretary.

Mr. W. Knight,

Hon. Secretary,

Belfast Teachers' Association.

Belfast, 27th January, 1911.

GENTLEMEN—I am in receipt of your letter of the 25th inst. The members of the deputation shall (D.V.) wait on the Resident Commissioner at the appointed time, viz.:—Monday, 6th February, at 3.30 p.m.—I am, gentlemen, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM KNIGHT,
Hon. Secretary.

The Secretaries,

Office of National Education.

55, Rosemount Gardens,
Belfast, 14th February, 1911.

SIR—The members of the deputation which waited on you on the 6th inst., wish to have a copy of the transcript of the Shorthand notes of the evidence tendered by each of them, in order that it may be corrected if necessary, and signed by each as a proof of accuracy.

Will you please send to my private address the necessary papers? I shall be responsible for their safety and security, and shall return them when signed.

With respect to any statements of a rebutting nature submitted by the Inspectors concerned, will you kindly furnish me with a copy of them. It may be necessary to reply to some of the statements advanced in extenuation of the mode of inspection that resulted in such a state of things, the outcome of which was our "Memorial" to the Commissioners.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM KNIGHT.

W. J. M. STARKIE, Esq., M.A., Litt.D.,
Resident Commissioner,
National Education.

Office of National Education,
Dublin, 17th February, 1911

DEAR SIR—I am requested by the Resident Commissioner to say in reply to your letter of the 14th instant, that a copy of the Shorthand note of the proceedings at the interview of the 6th instant will be sent you for perusal and correction, if necessary, as soon as the report is received from the printer. It is, of course, to be understood that the report is confidential and that the copy is to be returned to this office when it has been considered by you and your colleagues.

The question of furnishing you with copies of statements that may be made by the Inspectors concerned on the subject is one to which the Commissioners will give due consideration.—I am, dear Sir, yours faithfully,

A. N. BONAPARTE WYSE.

Mr. William Knight,

55, Rosemount Gardens,
Belfast.

ENCLOSURE.

Office of National Education,
Dublin, 1st March, 1911.

DEAR SIR—I am sending you herewith, as promised in my letter of the 17th ultimo, a copy of the Shorthand report of the proceedings at the recent interview with the Belfast deputation, and I shall be glad if you will look over it in consultation with your colleagues, and return it with any corrections that you consider to be necessary. I am inclined to think that the names of the speakers on behalf of

the deputation have not been correctly given in all cases and that the report of Mr. Larnour's opening statement is not altogether accurate. You and your friends will probably be able to make any correction that may be necessary on these points.—I am, dear sir, yours faithfully,

A. N. BONAPARTE WYSE.

Mr. William Knight,
55, Rosemount Gardens,
Belfast.

55, Rosemount Gardens,
Belfast, 26/4/1911.

SIR—On 17th February, a letter from A. N. B. Wyse, Esq., which said, "The question of furnishing you with copies of statements that may be made by the Inspectors concerned on the subject is one to which the Commissioner will give due consideration."

As I understand the Inspectors have now furnished their replies, I hope that you will kindly direct that copies of these replies be sent to me, for the benefit of the members of the deputation.

Since the Inspectors were furnished with our statements I think it is only fair and just that the teachers should be placed in possession of any statements, submitted by the Inspectors, and also copies of the report of the Chief Inspectors relative to this whole matter.—I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM KNIGHT.

W. J. M. Stankie, Esq., M.A., Litt.D.,
Resident Commissioner,
National Education.

Office of National Education,
Dublin, 3rd May, 1911.

DEAR SIR—In reply to your letter of the 26th ult., I am requested by the Resident Commissioner to say that the report and replies furnished by the Inspectors in connection with the statements of the recent deputation of Belfast teachers and considered by the Commissioners to be confidential, and they are unable to place copies of them in your hands.—I am, dear sir, yours faithfully,

A. N. BONAPARTE WYSE.

Mr. William Knight,
Whitehall Buildings,
Ann Street, Belfast.

Office of National Education,
Dublin, 2nd June, 1911.

SIR—The Commissioners have had before them the report of the deputation of the Belfast Teachers Association, received on 6th February, 1911, together with the observations of the Inspectors, whose conduct has been impugned.

Having carefully considered, in all their aspects, the difficult questions involved, the Commissioners are of the opinion that, while in view of the fact disclosed, the teachers were justified in appealing to them, there is no evidence to show that there has been any concerted action on the part of the administration to deal severely with the Belfast teachers or that the present standard of marking is unduly high in their Schools. Doubtless the returns indicate that some of the Inspectors now in Belfast are stricter than their predecessors; but, on the other hand, there is evidence that for five or six years subsequently to 1900 the standard of marking, at any rate in the County Down, was unduly low as compared with other parts of Ireland. Consequently the discrepancy of marking in late years, to which the teachers draw attention, is not so surprising as might appear on the surface.

The Commissioners recognize the ability with which the teachers' case was presented, but, after careful investigation, they consider that the colour given to some of the incidents cited, and the innuendoes made by some members of the deputation, are devoid of any justification.

The views of the Commissioners on the subject of the relations they desire to maintain between the Inspectors and the teachers have been fully stated

by the Resident Commissioner in his address of August 30th, 1900, from which the deputation quoted, and in his reply to the deputation, which the Commissioners accept as the best possible statement of their policy. They regret that it appears from the present enquiry that these relations are not as cordial as they would wish, and they hope that it will be possible to place them upon a better footing. The deputation complains that all independence in the teacher is crushed by the present system of inspection. This charge has much surprised the Commissioners. Since 1900, their desire has been to foster in the teacher a high spirit of self-respect and independence upon which, as they are aware, his moral influence over his pupils must mainly depend. The present system of inspection was designed for the purpose of cultivating these qualities. Since, however, the result does not appear, as yet, fully to answer to the aim of the Commissioners, they are taking further steps whereby their policy shall be more adequately realised, and carried into effect.—I am, sir, your obedient servant,

W. J. DULWORTH,
Secretary.

W. Knight, Esq.,
Hon. Secretary,
Belfast Teachers' Association.

Whitehall Buildings, Ann Street,
Belfast, 10th November, 1911.

GENTLEMEN—Acting under the instructions of the Committee of the above Association, I forwarded for the consideration of the National Board, a copy of "Teachers' Rejoinders to Inspectors' Observations" regarding deputation to the Resident Commissioner and Mr. Ward on 6th February, 1911.

I am instructed to point out that almost two months have since elapsed, and this Committee desire to know if this important document has been laid before the Board, and, if so, with what result. If this matter has not been considered by the Board, will you kindly let this Committee know when it will be considered?—I am, gentlemen, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM KNIGHT,
Hon. Secretary.

The Secretaries,
National Education,
Ireland.

L. 3696/11a.

Office of National Education,
Dublin, 16th November, 1911.

SIR—Referring to your letter of the 10th instant and previous correspondence, I am directed by the Commissioners of National Education to inform you that the observations of the Inspectors on the report of the proceedings in connection with the deputation from teachers of National Schools in Belfast made in February last, were not referred to these teachers for rejoinders. The observations of the Inspectors were confidential and for the consideration of the Commissioners only, and no authority was given by the Board to communicate these observations to the Belfast teachers in substance or in part. I am, therefore, to inform you that under the circumstances it was not deemed necessary to take any action in regard to the matters brought under notice by the members of the deputation beyond what has been indicated in the official letter addressed to you on the 2nd June last.—I am, sir, your obedient servant,

P. E. LEMASS,
Secretary.

William Knight,
Hon. Secretary,
Belfast Teachers' Association.

(ENCLOSURES 4).

55, Rosemount Gardens,
Belfast, 23rd December, 1911.

I beg to enclose a copy of a letter which I addressed to the Secretaries of the National Board on 10th November, and of their reply.

From the tone of this reply it seems useless to continue a correspondence through the usual officials

channel, and hence I am instructed to write to each individual Commissioner, making one more application to the Board for fair treatment.

I am instructed to point out that notwithstanding the facts brought before the Board in February last, no redress has been obtained.

It is unnecessary to recapitulate these facts, but it may be stated that the returns furnished to us by Rev. Dr. Bingham, and Rev. A. S. Woodward, M.A., showed a reduction of reports in almost 60 per cent. of Presbyterian and Church of Ireland schools respectively, and we now have reason to believe that other schools were also severely dealt with.

Teachers are not aware of any improvement in the treatment which they receive from Inspectors, but, on the contrary, the enclosed statements will show that in at least two cases attempts have been made to victimise members of the deputation.

Dr. Starkie told the deputation that impartial treatment would be meted out to Inspectors and teachers.

The Senior Inspectors of Belfast were present on 6th February and heard all that the deputation said, surely then was the time for them to make their defence, when they had the teachers face to face.

If it was thought necessary to give the Inspectors time to prepare a defence, the teachers think that that defence should have been made and the whole question fully investigated in the presence of both parties.

Instead of this procedure, the Inspectors were permitted to make their defence behind the teachers' backs, and it seems to be considered that the teachers had no right to learn what was said about them in their absence.

Teachers respectfully submit that the most elementary principles of law and justice have been violated by this mode of procedure, and earnestly hope it will not be approved by the Board.

Copies of "Teachers' Replies to Inspectors' Observations" were forwarded to each Commissioner, and teachers are fully aware of the gravity of the statements made in these Replies, and think that the Board is bound in honour to investigate these statements.

Teachers cannot believe that just and honourable men will permit what the deputationists say to pass without examination.

Teachers in the Belfast schools have now no confidence in the local Inspectors, and the enclosed letter of 16th November must have a tendency to shake their confidence in the officials in the Education Office.

Teachers still have confidence in the justice of the Commissioners, and to them they make one more appeal on behalf of many able, honest, hard-working teachers, who have been struggling for years to carry out every suggestion made by their Inspectors, but who have failed to obtain the rewards to which they feel they are in justice entitled.

Teachers respectfully submit that no worse state of affairs for Education can be imagined than that of teachers being forced to settle down in sullen and hopeless discontent at being the victims of harshness and injustice.

The prayer of the teachers is, that the Commissioners will further seriously consider the facts which have been presented to them, and will, at an early date, grant relief—I am, your obedient servant.

WILLIAM KNIGHT, Hon. Secretary,
Belfast Teachers' Association.

Ballymacarrett Road School (Roll No. 10867),
4/12/1911.

Ballymacarrett Road School, of which Mr. Todd is the principal teacher, was twice visited by Mr. Homan since the deputation was received on 6th February, and on each occasion his aim seemed to be to get Mr. Todd into trouble. On the 9th March, Mr. Homan tried to show that the Observation Book had been tampered with by Mr. Todd. He wrote:—"At noting 3, page 81, I noted and included 6th Standard as being weak at Arithmetic. 6th does not appear now, the place shows an ink stain and rubbing; Mr. Todd does not know how it happened.—P. J. HOMAN."

Mr. Todd wrote to Dr. Starkie on the 11th March, complaining about Mr. Homan, and mentioning amongst other matters Mr. Homan's insincerity in the examination of Mathematics in his School, and offering to produce proofs. To this complaint there was only a surly acknowledgment. Mr. Todd wrote again on the 21st August, asking for the result of the investigation as the Observation Book had been taken away by Mr. Dewar on 31st March, and returned on 12th June. He has not received any reply as yet. The entry in the Observation Book reads:—"Arithmetic is weak in 1st, 4th and 5th Standards," and was written on 17th November, 1909, by Mr. Homan. He visited on 12th January and 26th October, 1910, wrote reports each time in the Observation Book, read what he had written on 17th November, but never said one word about this list or the four others he made at the same time on the same page. It was only when making his defence that he discovered the alleged list and rubbing. Mr. Todd positively asserts he never altered or in any way interfered with any observation made by Mr. Homan or any other Inspector.

Mr. Homan again visited on 3rd November, and wrote in the Observation Book:—"It was a few minutes past the time when Rolls were completed to-day." Mr. Todd says the Rolls were marked entered on Attendance Book, and in Report Book at 10-13, two minutes before the time allowed on Time Table. Mr. Homan's visit lasted from 10-5 to 11-15. Before leaving he asked Mr. Todd was the clock not slow and was told that it was three minutes slow by his watch. The watch, however, was 15 minutes fast by the Albert Memorial Clock. The School is worked by School clock not by Mr. Todd's watch.

Mr. Homan did not mention at the same time that the lat assistant to complete her Roll was kept back by himself talking to her.

During the same visit he also wrote in large painted characters "No Pope here" appears in large letters on front of house next street. I saw it there also yesterday afternoon at 3-25 when passing. The teachers should exercise such vigilance as will prevent such objectionable statements appearing on the School walls. The public should not have access to the School premises before or after School hours."

The writing was not on the wall the previous day at one o'clock, as Mr. Todd was there with the children at lunch time. The wall is only nine feet from the street and is open to the public at all times. It forms part of the boundary of a passage into the church, and as the writing was behind a battress it could only be seen by a person going towards the city. Mr. Todd lives in the opposite direction, but two of the assistants when passing about 4 o'clock on the previous evening did not see it. Mr. Todd wrote to the Manager on 6th November, asking him to forward the letter when read, to the Board giving his explanation, but the latter said the matter was "too petty and personal between the Inspector and teacher," so Mr. Todd himself sent the original letter to the Board. Mr. Homan since being communicated with by the Board has either written to or visited the Manager, and as he was present at moments when an investigation was held by Mr. Dewar between the Manager and the teachers under him, he must know the relations between them.

Mr. Todd states that Mr. Homan in the "Observations of the Inspectors" changed the marks obtained by his pupils in 2nd year Algebra from 17 to 14. He can prove this by Mr. Homan's own handwriting. Mr. Todd thinks it is only fair that the Commissioners should be made aware of these facts before coming to a decision.

Ravenhill N. School (Roll No. 14619),
Belfast, 4/12/11.

Since the Deputation waited on Dr. Starkie on 6th February, 1911, the above School, of which Mr. Boyd, one of the deputationists, is Principal, has received very particular attention from the Inspectors. During the 17 years ending 31/3/10, in which the School was in operation, there were 29 Inspectors' visits, or an average of 1.7 per year. In the period between 23/3/11 and 14/11/11, there were seven Inspectors' visits, or an average of 2 per year. Two of these visits with a period of nine months between were named "Annual Inspections" and

each lasted for two days. During the past eleven years—since the new method of marking reports was introduced—the School got "Good" three times, "Very Good" five times, and "Excellent" three times. According to the Board's circular of 30/5/11, in a School with a record like above "it is unnecessary that detailed inspections be made each year. Visits for a general report may, as a rule, be short."

A more searching inspection of the work of a school of this class should, however, take place occasionally, say once in every three or four years, &c." It cannot but be evident to anyone why the Inspectors at present in Belfast should deem it necessary (instead of following the instructions in the circular referred to) to hold two "annual" inspections, lasting two days each, within 9 months in this School, and also to make five incidental visits during the same time. The circular also states "Expressions of satisfaction shall appear there (in Observation Book) as well as notes concerning defects in the work." Since Mr. MacMillan got charge of inspecting this School in August, 1907, eighteen pages of the Observation Book have been written. Except in a few minor details re order and discipline no "Expressions of satisfaction" appear, all those pages being a succession of fault finding. In his notes in Observation Book made last month about 13 defects were noted, but nothing was found in this large School worthy of praise. In the Principal's opinion most of these defects existed only in the Inspector's imagination.

The three following examples of Mr. MacMillan's treatment of this School have been brought under the notice of the Education Office, and in each case the Office decided that Mr. MacMillan was wrong.

On August 11th, 1910, he noted—"The maximum number on the Rolls must be limited to 625." (Two years earlier he gave instructions to limit the number of Rolls to 643). As this would have meant a reduction in the teaching staff the Manager made an appeal to the Board on 30th August. On 10th and 11th November a letter (L. 841-10, C. 5) was received stating that as vacancies occurred in the teaching staff such vacancies were not to be filled and the attendance was to be gradually reduced to the limits prescribed by Rule 185.

On 13th June last the Inspector called again and expressed himself in a manner not too courteous because the Principal had not followed his instructions of August 11th. Mr. Boyd told Mr. MacMillan that he did not believe the Board intended to victimise teachers, and this would certainly be the case if he literally followed Rule 185. The Inspector replied that reducing the attendance would not mean the dismissal of teachers. Mr. Boyd said that he knew if the average were reduced teachers would be obliged to leave. Mr. MacMillan replied in a very aggressive way, "You know! much you know!" The Principal also said that he would ask the Manager to write to the Board for instructions. Mr. MacMillan replied in his most gruff way, "You can do what you like, but I know what I'll do."

Mr. Boyd wrote the following letter to the Manager, and he forwarded it to the Education Office:—

"Ravenscroft N. School,
Belfast, June 13, 1911.

"DEAR DOCTOR—The Inspector, Mr. MacMillan, examined our Mathematics to-day. He was very indignant with me for taking, as he says, a wrong meaning out of the letter you got from the Education Office, dated 9th November (L. 841/10, C. 5). This letter states: 'Should the provision of adequate accommodation as laid down in Rule 185 not be feasible on the occurrence of vacancies in the present staff (12) of assistants, such vacancies, to the number of three, are not to be filled, and the attendance is to be gradually reduced by the non-enrolment of new pupils, to the limits prescribed in that Rule.' I took this to mean that in reply to your appeal about safe-guarding the present staff the number then allowed on Rolls (643) was not to be interfered with, but as vacancies occurred on the staff we were then to enrol no new pupils until the staff would be reduced by three.

The Inspector's interpretation of the letter is that no new pupil should have been enrolled since the date of your letter, 9th November last, and that a lowering of the attendance consequent on this would not endanger the teachers' positions. He has

threatened to get all new admissions cancelled from our attendance since 9th November.

Will you kindly ask the Office or the Board which is the correct interpretation of this letter? If the Inspector be correct why were you notified that owing to a fall of new pupils for last quarter salary is to be withdrawn from our last Assistant for next quarter unless the attendance should be up to the standard—645. But should he be correct in his statement, or rather threat, that we must exceed the attendance of all new pupils since November 9th, then all I can say is that we shall have some useless employment for our holidays. There were 26 new pupils admitted since 9th November, as well as many re-admissions, so you can understand the task which Mr. MacMillan proposes for us in 1911.

I think it is a great pity that troubles, not in connection with our proper duties as educators, seem recently to have become interminable, and the more thoroughly we try to do our work, we seem to get the less credit for it.—Sincerely yours,

WM. C. BOYD.

"Dr. Fraser,
"Gethyside, Strandtown, Belfast."

On 26th June last, the Manager received a letter from the Office similar to that of 9th November. Undeterred by his want of success on the two previous occasions to get teachers dismissed, he again called on 13th September, and noted, "Rule 185 is now in force, and therefore further enrolments cannot be made until average has fallen to the number allowed by the rule unless special exemption is granted by the Commissioners." As this would have meant the dismissal of three assistants, the Manager again appealed to the Board, and, as was only to be expected, a satisfactory reply was received again safeguarding the teachers.

It is worthy of note that at this Inspector's previous visit on 14th August, he informed the Principal that he was going on his holidays during September. However, his anxiety to detect probable dishonesty in this particular School was so great that his keen sense of duty compelled him to visit it at 9-5 a.m. one day in the middle of his holidays.

The methods of this Inspector had been seriously impugned by the members of the deputation. It is evident that he treats Dr. Starkie's wishes as expressed to the deputation, as well as the Board's decision of June, 1911, with the utmost contempt. Had Mr. MacMillan been taught an Inspector's duties, the Manager, who is a busy professional man, the Principal who has sufficient serious duties to attend to in supervising this large School, and the Officials in the Education Office would have been saved the trouble and annoyance of writing so many letters in defence of the rights of the teachers.

Re "MEMORIAL" DEPUTATION, 6/2/1911.

56, Rosemount Gardens,
Belfast, 19/12/1911.

DEAR SIR—I am instructed by the above Association to intimate to you that they are intensely dissatisfied with the present position of affairs in connection with the "Memorial" presented by the deputation on 6th February, 1911.

You will doubtless recollect the following opening made by you as follows:—

"Before our discussion begins, I wish to remind you that, as in the case of all other deputations, strict confidence must be observed; and that no report of the proceedings must be issued unless it is first submitted to me. That ought to be done in every case. Do you agree to these conditions?"

You will also recollect that:—

"Mr. Knight (Kington Street N.E.) said they accepted the conditions."

In view of these facts, I am instructed by the Belfast Teachers' Association to ascertain from you, if the statements read by the individual members of the deputation were to be treated as confidential in the same sense that they are not to be used on any other occasion, or for any other purpose.—I am, dear sir, yours faithfully,

WILLIAM KNIGHT, Hon. Secretary,
Belfast Teachers' Association.

W. J. M. Starkie, Esq., M.A., Litt.D.,
Resident Commissioner,
National Education.

Office of National Education,
Dublin, 22nd December, 1911.

DEAR SIR—With reference to your letter of the 19th instant, I am requested by the Resident Commissioner to say that before giving you a reply to the enquiry contained in your letter, he would require to know for what purpose and on what occasion the Belfast Teachers' Association wish to make use of the statements read by the individual members of the deputation of February last.—I am, dear sir, yours faithfully,

A. N. BONAPARTE WISE.
Mr. William Knight,
35, Rosemount Gardens, Belfast.

35, Rosemount Gardens,
Belfast, 11th January, 1912.

DEAR SIR—In your reply to your communication of 22nd December, I am instructed to state that while the members of the deputation regard as strictly confidential the statements made by the Resident Commissioner on the 6th February, 1911, they do not consider as confidential the statements made by themselves on that date, especially since these statements have been submitted to a number of Inspectors.

They do not, however, wish to have even the appearance of acting contrary to the undertaking which I, on their behalf, gave on that occasion.

The Memorial and correspondence connected with it, were entrusted to a committee that had full authority, but this committee considers that the time has now come for letting the Association and all the Memorialists know what has been done in their name.

It is, therefore, proposed to communicate the statements of the deputationists to the teachers concerned.—I am, dear sir, yours faithfully,

WILLIAM KNIGHT, Hon. Secretary,
Belfast Teachers' Association.

W. J. M. Stankie, Esq., M.A., Litt.D.,
Resident Commissioner,
National Education.

Office of National Education,
Dublin, 18th January, 1912.

DEAR SIR—I am desired by the Resident Commissioners to say that your request regarding the statements made by the deputation of Belfast teachers at the interview with him last year, will be considered by the Commissioners at their meeting next week.—I am, yours faithfully,

A. N. BONAPARTE WISE.
Mr. William Knight.

Office of National Education,
Dublin 26th January, 1912.

SIR—With reference to the enquiry in your letter of the 10th ultimo to the Resident Commissioner, whether the statements made by the individual members of the deputation of the Belfast Teachers' Association, which attended at this Office on 6th February last, "were to be treated as confidential in the sense that they were not to be used on any other occasion or for any other purpose." I am directed by the Commissioners of National Education to reply as follows:—

While it is open to the Belfast teachers to repeat on some other occasion the statements referred to, the Commissioners desire to point out that they regarded the occasion of the visit of the deputation as a privileged one, and, accordingly, certain objectionable statements made by the teachers were allowed to pass without any adverse action being taken. If, however, publicity is given to these statements, the Commissioners must reserve to

themselves the right to take such action as the circumstances may require.

The Commissioners regret that the Belfast Teachers' Association has not loyally accepted their decision as conveyed by the official letter of 2nd June last. The course adopted by the teachers of holding back their complaints for a considerable period and then submitting them simultaneously was not one calculated to enable the Commissioners to arrive at a wholly satisfactory decision.

In a letter which was recently addressed to a section of the teachers who made complaints in this manner it was stated: "Such a proceeding is objectionable."

(a) In the interests of the teachers who may have a real grievance, and the Inspector whose conduct is impugned, because, owing to the lapse of time, trustworthy evidence is more difficult to procure, and therefore a just appreciation of the points in dispute and the redress that should follow become less certain.

(b) From the point of view of the Commissioners, who are called on to consider in a brief time a multitude of details requiring lengthy discussion and investigation, which the delay in presenting them has rendered impracticable:

"While ready at all times to investigate fully charges brought against the Inspectors in the regular and prescribed manner, the Commissioners will in future decline to entertain appeals made after long delay as in this case."

In the circular which was issued in June last, the Commissioners' view as to the proper relations which should subsist between the teachers and the Inspectors were fully set forth, and they expect from both the teachers and the Inspectors a loyal and friendly co-operation in the work of the education of the children attending the National Schools.—I am, sir, your obedient servant,

W. J. DELWORTH,
Secretary.

William Knight, Esq.,
Hon. Secretary,
Belfast Teachers' Association.

35, Rosemount Gardens,
Belfast, 2/2, 1912.

GENTLEMEN—The letter of the Commissioners of the 26th ult., has been carefully considered by the Committee of the Belfast Teachers' Association, and I am instructed to ask that the Commissioners will please specify the statements which are referred to in paragraph 2, "Certain objectionable statements made by the teachers were allowed to pass without any adverse action being taken.—I am, gentlemen, yours faithfully,

WILLIAM KNIGHT, Hon. Secretary,
Belfast Teachers' Association.

The Secretaries,
National Education,
Ireland.

Office of National Education,
Dublin, 8th February, 1912.

SIR—Referring to your letter of the 2nd instant, in which you ask that the objectionable statements to which allusion is made in the official letter of the 26th ultimo, may be specified, I am directed by the Commissioners of National Education to inform you that every member of the deputation that waited on the Resident Commissioner in February last year must be conscious of the statements in question, which were obviously objectionable. In the circumstances, it is considered unnecessary to refer further to them in detail.—I am, sir, your obedient servant,

P. E. LEWIS,
Secretary.

Wm. Knight, Esq.,
Hon. Secretary,
Belfast Teachers' Association.

APPENDIX XLVI.

(Handed in by Mr. C. H. Todd, Principal, Ballymacreagh Road N.S., Belfast.)

DEPUTATION FROM TEACHERS OF BELFAST CIRCUITS TO THE RESIDENT COMMISSIONER AND MR. WARD, ON 6TH FEBRUARY, 1911.

TEACHERS' REPLY TO INSPECTORS' OBSERVATIONS.

The two Senior Inspectors of Belfast were present during the reception of the Deputation, but refused to make any reply to the teachers, or to ask any questions. It appears, however, that a report of the Deputation was sent to the Inspectors who had been in Belfast during the years in question, and that they were called on for replies. We asked for copies of these replies, but were refused. Some Commissioners, from a sense of fair play, thought we should know the nature of the Inspectors' observations, and, therefore, read them to the members of the Deputation, who took notes, and now send their rejoinders. We therefore furnish:—

- (1) The result of the census taken by Rev. J. Bingham, D.D., and Rev. A. S. Woodward, M.A.
- (2) Our views of the statement made by the Chief Inspectors.
- (3) Mr. Todd's reply to the Chief Inspectors, and to Messrs. Dewar, Hannon, and Welply.
- (4) Mr. Boyd's reply to Messrs. Dewar and Mac-Millan.
- (5) Mr. Lammour's reply to Messrs. Mangan, Welply, and Kelly.
- (6) Mr. McCullagh's reply to Mr. Kelly.
- (7) Mr. Thomson's reply to Messrs. Dewar and Hannon.
- (8) Board's reply to Memorial and Teachers' rejoinder to same.

We do not look on these rejoinders as exhaustive but give them as specimens, and have effective replies to any points in the Inspectors' observations which are not mentioned in these statements.

- (1) *The Result of the Census taken by Rev. J. Bingham, D.D., and Rev. A. S. Woodward, M.A.*

(1) Dr. Bingham and Rev. A. S. Woodward sent out circulars to all managers belonging to their respective denominations, asking particulars of reports for the years 1904-5-6-7-8-9. The following is the result:—

Schools under Presbyterian Management.—158 Returns received, of which 74 had Report reduced, giving 46.8 per cent. of reduction.

Schools under Church of Ireland Management.—99 Returns received, of which 47 had Report reduced, giving 47.4 per cent. of reduction.

None but Schools under Presbyterian and C.I. management are included in the above Census. There are 708 Schools in Belfast Circuits (1 and 2). Returns have been obtained from 267 of these. The Commissioners can order a return of all the Schools for the years 1904-9 inclusive. By this means the Commissioners will be able to test the accuracy of the above figures, and will also find the reasons of the teachers' complaint.

- (2) *Our Views of the Statements made by the Chief Inspectors.*

The most remarkable feature of the Chief Inspectors' observations is the narrow, bitter, partisan spirit breathed in almost every line, and the entire absence of that impartiality, which teachers had a right to expect from them. They blame, by implication, the Board for having permitted the teachers to state their case, and Dr. Starke for having permitted them to abuse the unprecedented opportunity. They charge the deputation with having furnished particulars that are vague. We shall not attempt to solve the problem of how "particulars" can be vague, as Mr. Todd deals with this in detail.

Dr. Starke gave the Inspectors an opportunity of cross-examining the Deputation, but they declined to ask any questions. It is shown clearly by Mr. Todd that the Chief Inspectors had ample oppor-

tunity of checking the statements as to errors of fact, and that there is still means of verifying these statements.

The teachers never made the statement that "the percentage of satisfactory reports for all Ireland had risen 5 per cent., while for Belfast it had sunk 15 per cent." and, therefore, they asked that these figures be amended in the report.

The figures embodied by the Deputation are contained in the table of statistics (taken from the Commissioners' Reports), which was handed to Dr. Starke, on 5th February, and the comments on the figures in that table are set forth at page 15 of the printed report of the Deputation.

It is impossible that one of the Deputation could, as stated on page 23 of this report, see the figures "5 per cent." and "15 per cent.," because Dr. Starke, who had this table before him, and was following the figures quoted, would at once have asked how 5 per cent. could be obtained by taking 62.7 per cent. of the 1904 Report from 67.2 per cent. of the 1905 Report, and how 15 per cent. could be got as the difference of 74 per cent. and 78 per cent., taken from Mr. Kelly's figures to 1904 and 1905 Reports.

It seems strange that the Chiefs of Inspection, who heard the figures quoted at the interview, should fasten on an evident mistake of the reporter, and build their chief argument against the teachers on it. The assertion that the Deputation, within a couple of weeks, desired to amend the figures is very misleading, and reflects no credit on those who made it. The only amendment desired was the correcting of the proof sheets sent down, which were admittedly wrong.

It has been asserted that the tables handed in by the teachers are confusing and inaccurate. These figures were taken from the Board's Blue Books, and are neither confusing nor inaccurate. If the Board's Books are correct. The figures given by the Chiefs are certainly not remarkable for clearness. They give a table of 599 schools, and then enter into elaborate details about "points," which can only confuse the reader. They do not say where these schools are to be found, or whether they are connected with Belfast. Assuming, however, that they belong to Belfast circuit, they show a more alarming state of affairs than anything mentioned by the teachers. Take, for example, 1904-5 compared with 1907-8. The schools that got "Excellent" or "Very Good" number 182 in the former year, and only 114 in the latter—a decrease of 68, or more than one-third in three years. Take again for the same years the schools marked "Fair." These number 19 in the former year, and 43 in the latter—that is, the lower reports were more than doubled, while the higher were reduced by more than one-third. The other years show a similar result.

Teachers cannot understand, and the Chiefs altogether fail to explain, this wholesale lowering of Reports in Belfast, while in other parts of Ireland the Reports were being raised. This lowering of Reports coincided with the advent of Mr. Hynes.

The Chiefs admit that some Inspectors now in Belfast are stricter than their predecessors. Why is this, and what made them stricter? It is asserted that no instructions were issued to the Belfast Inspectors to lower Reports, but there are other ways of getting the work done, and two facts mentioned in the Inspectors' Observations are very instructive—(1) The Chiefs mention a school where an Inspector had given "Very Good," and where the written exercises were extremely unsatisfactory, and for this reason the Inspector was transferred to another Circuit. This example would be sufficient to let other Inspectors know what was wanted, and we believe coincided with the introduction of lower Reports. (2) Mr. Lavelle mentions that Mr. Kelly told him of the result of his examination in Eglintown Street, and it is quite evident this led to the action of Mr. Lavelle. These two incidents clearly show how certain results can be obtained.

The Chiefs say that the fact that comparatively few appeals are received affords proof that teachers did not feel injustice had been done to them. If this be so, surely appeals from between 300 and 350

teachers show that great injustice has been done. We believe, however, that few appeals are made, because teachers feel it is hopeless to appeal. The Chiefs cannot say that re-inspection is always granted on appeal. Mr. MacMillan says, that when he was stationed in Mayo, from 1901, very seldom was a re-inspection asked, and in no case was it granted. The long delays in sending reports, and in dealing with cases where managers appeal, are sufficient to account for the paucity of appeals. We might ask why no re-inspection was granted in Mr. MacMillan's circuit.

The Chiefs also mention the easy marking and leniency formerly shown by Belfast Inspectors. Who discovered that? Does it not prove conclusively that there has been some influence at work in Belfast which has not operated in other parts of Ireland, and that the present state of affairs is not accidental?

The Chiefs try to throw the blame on the Resident Commissioner, when they say that his frequent visits to schools induce Inspectors to exercise greater discrimination. We do not believe they are correct in this, but it is a confession of their own neglect.

The most objectionable part of this very one-sided report is, where the Chiefs attribute the material to the growing intolerance of authority noticeable in all classes of subordinates. We emphatically assert there is no such spirit of intolerance among us; and the attempt thus to prejudice our case in the eyes of the Board is wicked in the extreme, and plainly shows the spirit in which the Chiefs have noted throughout this whole affair.

The Chiefs state that in general the Inspectors do not know when an increment is due. Our experience is that they know in almost every case.

The fact that a man had been a teacher does not make him infallible. Certainly Mr. Fenton was not a favourite in Belfast, and we fear he is no better liked in other parts of Ireland. The Chiefs' admission about the complaints made regarding him does not surprise us in Belfast.

It seems amusing to find an Inspector producing a certificate of character from Rev. R. U. Green. Mr. Green served notice of dismissal on two of his teachers, but did not dare to carry out the evictions; and when it is remembered that he was never present during any visit or inspection by Mr. Kelly, his certificate may not have the same weight.

The Chiefs admit that Mr. MacMillan has a brief, rather abrupt, style of addressing one. We say, without any hesitation, that a man of this character is out of place as an Inspector. He should be taught to be gentle in his dealings with children. Is it any wonder, in view of this admission from men who do their best to apologise for him, that his reports are much worse than the average, and that we never knew a teacher who had a good word to say for him? We think the Board should insist that all their Inspectors should be gentlemanly in their demeanour, and kind and sympathetic towards the children. Any man who is not of a sympathetic nature is entirely out of place in any position connected with schools. Such a person may be fitted for a jail official, or a policeman, but certainly not for an Inspector of Schools.

Mr. Hynds gives a certificate to Mr. Kelly, and tells of the pleasure manifested at his presence in some schools visited. Who selected the schools? Every teacher will courteously receive any officer of the Board no matter how bad he may be. Courtesy and pleasure are not synonymous.

(3) Mr. Todd's Reply.

As the member of the Deputation from the Belfast Group of Districts, who made the opening statement to Dr. Starkie and Mr. Ward, it is my duty to submit a rejoinder to the observations of the Inspectors who referred to me.

With the first paragraph of "Observations of Chief Inspectors" I entirely agree, with this addition that the Deputation are able to prove every statement they have made.

When the Inspectors concerned were asked, at the interview by Dr. Starkie, what reply they had to make to the charges, there seemed to be a conspiracy of silence, though it is evident from their written statements, they knew to which Inspector each charge referred. How can it be said we

declined to name schools, when we submitted the names of over 100 in our memorial?

It is most unfortunate that the great body of teachers here have lost hope of any redress from the Chief Inspectors.

The observation with regard to "principals and assistants in Belfast, who have reached their maximum salary," might with equal justice be applied to officers, not teachers, who labour in the cause of primary education.

In my opinion, a better method might easily have been found to test the marking of the schools than the one adopted by the Chief Inspectors; with the results of their inspection I have nothing to do. The idea that "R.C. schools were specially favoured," existed only in the minds of the Chief Inspectors. The reply of the Deputation when asked about R.C. teachers was—"They did not sign."

The sneer about subordinates is beneath notice. I think it is scarcely fair to the Resident Commissioner indirectly to charge him with the lowering of marks.

What other reason would the Chief Inspectors give for the Junior Inspector's not entering his remarks in the "Observation Book" for some weeks than that he wanted to consult his Senior?

Every person knows that in the time of the "Results" system, an inspector and teacher might differ in their ideas of the proficiency of the pupils in certain subjects, but it is also well-known that even in the largest schools it was quite possible to make a pretty correct estimate of the amount of money likely to be earned, before the examination took place. Who can now estimate correctly the mark an Inspector will give a school? On the mark awarded the promotion or increment depends, therefore, where is the "quibbling" in stating that Inspectors thus become our paymasters?

The Chief Inspectors say—"Personally be (Mr. Todd) can know nothing of certain schools," but I do know that I have visited certain schools when my own has been closed for various reasons.

No complaint has ever been made by any of my assistants as manager, Inspector, or National Board, about overwork in my school during the thirty-seven years I have acted as principal, and I most emphatically repeat my statement that the baggard appearance of many teachers is due to the worry caused by the Inspectors' bias.

Again it is stated—"The Chief Inspectors have no means of checking the statements as to errors of fact." Does that apply to the case of the lavatory? to the case of the globe and kindergarten? to the number of teachers employed in the principal room? to the examination in algebra? to the Junior Inspector who did not write up the Observation Book? or to the case of the school reported on by five different Inspectors? These cases can all be checked and verified, if the Chief Inspectors have any doubt about them.

Mr. Dewar says:—"As few, if any, appeals were made for a re-inspection, I can only conclude that no teacher considered his school worthy of a higher mark than had been awarded." Mr. Dewar cannot deny that on at least two occasions I applied to him to come on the following year after his inspection, as I considered and told him that the school was worthy of a higher mark than he had awarded.

Mr. Dewar in all fairness might have stated that on the day of his inspection of my school, I was absent for more than half the time, having been requested to meet one of the Commissioners; that owing to the appointment of one of my assistants as principal of a school in Downpatrick, his successor had only been present four days previous to his visit; that I had taken that opportunity to change another assistant from a class, where she did not appear to be in harmony with her pupils, to another; that practically both these teachers scarcely know the names of their scholars.

With regard to the desks, Mr. Dewar knew we were in treaty with the Board of Works for the purchase of desks, which we got in a few days afterwards, but he does not mention this. Mr. Dewar does not state that when I returned I called his attention to all these matters, as well as to the fact that besides the ordinary Time-Table in the school, there was fastened on the wall a temporary one, to see how it would work under the new arrangements. The infants always got a fair share of the use of the desks, and if they did not on that day, I

think the reason is obvious, owing to changes of teachers, my absence, and the temporary time-table. Mr. Dewar also states:—"The infants, 109 pupils, are taught by one assistant." Again, he says:—"At one period the mistress had charge of 63 infants." The assistant at that period must only be Mr. Dewar's own showing, have had charge of 34. Mr. Dewar, in speaking of Mr. Honan's inspection, dwells on the agreement in their opinions, and on the impossibility of Mr. Honan having seen his marks. All I know about that is, Mr. Honan read over very carefully, and underlined, a portion of what Mr. Dewar had written in the Observation Book, as well as the "Minute," before he wrote his own Report.

But what sympathy can Mr. Dewar have with teachers, when he has stated that he could reduce a school from "Excellent" to "Bad," and say his prayers with a clear conscience, and also make a boast that he had told a Junior Inspector to reduce away, as long as he had (Mr. Dewar) as his back?

Mr. Honan says:—"There are two references to me in Mr. Todd's statement:—(1) with reference to his examination in mathematics; and (2) with reference to the mark given to the school." Mr. Honan might have stated that there were three references; but I shall come to the third later. With regard to the examination in mathematics, my two reasons for objection were—early examination and the absence of some of my best pupils at an excursion. There were only 22 present to be examined on that date, and I had 34 for the remainder of the week.

Mr. Honan did show me his questions, and there was such disparity between them and those given by Mr. O'Connell the previous year, that I was quite willing to have the examination, when Mr. Honan spoke of the addition of 30 per cent. I object to his statement that he gave the easiest. He had only a few cards (all very fair and about equal in difficulty, copies, as he told me, of the late Mr. McCallum's). The same questions permeated the cards in a great measure, and I unhesitatingly assert that there was no picking or choosing—that he gave the very same cards in other schools long afterwards.

With regard to his calculation of the result, which I have already shown to Dr. Taylor and Mr. Ward, and which is in Mr. Honan's own handwriting, he divides 17 by 40 and gets 42 per cent. He should have divided by 35 (as there were only 7 children examined, and each got five questions), and would have obtained 48·5 per cent., which, with 30 per cent. additional, gets 58·2 per cent. according to Mr. Honan's method of calculation. Mr. Honan, in his statement, changes to the correct divisor, 35, but to get 42 per cent. he reduces the correct total, 17, to 14½ marks. If a teacher had done this, it would be considered an act of cool, deliberate fabrication on his part. I hold the questions and the calculation, which I can produce at any time.

As the Inspectors are now publishing testimonials to themselves from teachers and managers, Mr. Honan varies the monotony by certifying his own good character, while he presents other inspectors as well as myself, with his opinion of our conscientiousness, honesty, and candour.

"No Inspector," he says, "could conscientiously give this school a higher mark than 'Good.'" Note Mr. Honan's idea of the consciences of Messrs. Chambers, Mangan, O'Connell, and Fenton, who each gave "Very Good," and his opinion of himself, an Inspector who deliberately changes the total answers made by the children from 17 to 14½, so as to get a preconceived percentage, and who enters his visit as from 9 to 12, and from 1-30 to 4, but who entered the building at 10-10, and left at 3-10. Mr. Honan says:—"Mr. Todd's notions of honour and candour are brought to light by the garbled and misleading version he gives." I do not think I shall enter into competition with Mr. Honan as to honour and candour, after the true light has now been thrown on the matter.

Perhaps it may be well to mention that Mr. Honan never asked a single root, prefix, or affix, yet he says:—"On referring to my notes, I also find that Sixth standard, taught by Mr. Todd, knew nothing of roots, prefixes, and affixes." It seems a very safe thing for him to say—"Familiarity and perhaps Drawing could get a higher mark than 'Good,'" as the work in these subjects may still be in evidence for aught he knows.

With regard to my third reference, which Mr. Honan does not mention, viz.—"Five teachers being almost constantly at work in the main room," I am afraid the only testimonial I can give him on this count will not help him much, as five teachers are never at work in the main room.

Mr. Honan complains that I compare his inspection on 9th, 10th, and 11th December, 1902, with the one in 1901, and says I used the word *trava*. I used the word *trava* in my statement, which statement Mr. Ward saw, and which the reporter had in his possession for several days. Mr. Honan tries to make capital out of this, but our case is so clear that we do not require to depart in the slightest degree from the straight course. He tries to explain away the difference in the principal mark of his two reports, and says if there had been an intermediate mark, between "Excellent" and "Good," we should have got it, although he gave "Excellent" for Spelling, Drawing, Elementary Science, Singing, and School Discipline and Physical Drill; "Very Good" for Reading, Writing, Grammar, Composition, Arithmetic, and Needlework; "Good" for Kindergarten and Manual Instruction.

I fear I have already taken up too much space and will close by referring to Mr. Welply, who says:—"Mr. Todd very properly objects to some Imaginary Inspector, who could tell all about a school in five minutes." The Inspector is not imaginary. It is Mr. Dewar.

(4) Mr. Boyd's Reply.

Mr. Dewar states:—"The 111 schools received the Inspectors' Reports from the Education Office, within one month from the dates of inspection."

The following is my experience of the truth of above statement during the past few years:—

Date of Examination.	Date of Issuing Report (from Office).
12th, 25th, and 30th June, 1904 ..	29th July, 1904.
25th and 27th August, 1907 ..	18th October, 1907.
14th and 15th April, 1906 ..	25th May, 1906.
29th and 30th June, 1909 ..	21st August, 1909.
26th and 10th March, 1910 ..	25th April, 1910.
MATHEMATICS	
Not Assessed.	
15th June, 1908 ..	27th January, 1909.
22nd June, 1906 ..	1st October, 1906.
22nd June, 1910 ..	26th August, 1910.

I appealed re examination in mathematics in 1908, but result was not such as to encourage me to appeal again.

Mr. Dewar states:—"I beg to deny most emphatically two statements made by Mr. Boyd." They are:—

"(a) In conversation with Mr. Dewar, in November, 1908, he informed me that we in the North know nothing whatever about teaching, when compared with teachers in other parts of Ireland."

"(b) . . . and that he (Mr. MacMillan) was sent to our district to re-use the teachers up."

I beg most emphatically to re-assert that he made both statements to me, and that he also repeated (a) to Mr. Moore, Short Strand N. School; Mr. Todd, Ballymacreilly Road N. School; and Dr. Gibson, J.P., Mountpottinger House, Belfast.

Mr. Dewar took up duties as Inspector in his native city a few years ago, prejudiced against its teachers, and never wastes in giving expression to his low opinion of them. As proof of his short memory, I may mention that, when inspecting my school two weeks and three days after our Deputation had appeared before Dr. Starke, he questioned me about our method of marking the rolls. I reminded that this matter had been discussed before Dr. Starke. He appeared to have forgotten all about it, but after an effort he seemed to remember that there had been a Deputation, and remarked that he "did not listen to anything that was said all the time."

Mr. MacMillan, 18th February, 1908:—"There is not sufficient evidence of preparation by the staff. Mr. Boyd should exercise supervision over this matter. Fifth standard writing is inferior, and errors in written exercises are not always corrected." Mr. MacMillan here insinuates that the teachers have neglected their duty. If these adult teachers, who understand their duty, are doing their work properly, I can see no necessity for me insulting them by treating them as children. Mr. MacMillan does not specify where the neglect of preparation

occurs. He is the first Inspector who ever said that I neglect my duty. Unless his report is false, as I unhesitatingly assert that it is, then all the other Inspectors, who have reported favourably on my work, are as untruthfully as I am. If his reports are untrue, as I intend to prove they are, then it follows that he is unfit for the responsible position he holds. His complaint about the undetected errors in written exercises had some foundation. Unfortunately, very few of our pupils have yet arrived at a state of perfection. I have seldom met anyone who was not liable to make a mistake in writing. Even Mr. MacMillan himself is not infallible. For example, he wrote in my Observation Book, on 27th October, 1908:—

"3. Special pains should be taken with I. and E., when writing, to see that they hold the pen properly, and not to write with the age of it."

"4. I would like of find I. and E. both reader at the Addition Table."

If a highly-paid and highly-favoured Inspector can thus make three blunders in two succeeding sentences, I think he should extend a little leniency to teachers, who are doing their utmost honestly to earn their meagre salaries. I also acknowledge that the writing of the 5th standard is often inferior. If it were perfect the pupils would probably be in higher classes.

Same date:—"Writing of 1st standard should be of better quality. Let the pupils write busily the whole of the time, and they should be able to fill at least a page of an ordinary exercise book." I deny that the writing was indifferent. I had examined the class about that time, and marked more severely than any Inspector should do. I awarded 75-3 per cent. to the boys, and 75-1 to the girls. I also assert that it is impossible for pupils in 1st standard, "to fill at least a page of an ordinary exercise book," carefully executed, in half an hour. The note, "Let the pupils write busily the whole of the time," is too absurd for comment.

"(d) Reading from tablets should be discontinued." We had much better reading and spelling, and more rapid progress when tablets were used, and I was not aware that their use, which had long been sanctioned and encouraged by the Board, had suddenly become such a serious offense. (See Joyce, 1897, re tablets).

"(e) Those (girls) of IV. and V. should not, except for some exceptional work, sew with coloured thread."

(See "Notes for Teachers," 1910, pp. 82 and 83; also consult Miss Froendgast).

"(f) Pupils reading should not come out and stand beside teacher; let them stay in their places and speak out clearly. Following words with a finger should not be allowed."

(See Joyce, 1897, p. 96; also Cox and MacDonald, p. 125, re pointing with the finger). After all these gentlemen may have been right.

"On 18th February, 1908, I found Mr. Hamilton at an arithmetic class, merely examining his class (standard iv. boys)."

Where was the crime? Two months later, Mr. MacMillan found the arithmetic work of four teachers "Bad" or "Middling," yet previously these teachers were regarded as very successful workers.

14th April, 1908:—"I again found written work of V. class girls very carelessly marked. That of boys is better, but not satisfactory."

It was explained to Inspector, that as the teacher of 6th and 7th standards was absent for a few days at that time, owing to the death of her brother, the 6th standard teachers were doing her work in addition to their own. Any reasonable man would have accepted this as an explanation of the apparent carelessness.

Same date:—"There are at present 225 infants taught by two teachers. These pupils cannot be getting efficient instruction, especially as they are crowded."

I consider this one of the most glaring of all Mr. MacMillan's misstatements. Above was the number on rolls, and this number, as I explained at the time, was abnormal. Many of our infants were very young children, so that the proportion in attendance to the number on rolls was, and is, always low. Besides in April, May, and June, the attendance of infants is at the maximum. The following is the

average attendance of our infants for six separate months:—

	Average Attendance.	
April, 1908	..	183-8
April, 1911	..	163-0
August, 1908	..	142-0
August, 1910	..	142-8
December, 1909	..	126-4
March, 1910	..	148-1

These pupils had two well-qualified assistants with them all the time, and four paid monitors who would at least equal one assistant, besides the help of good senior girls who were candidate monitors. These unfortunate assistants, who are thus represented as being over-worked owing to my bad organising powers, seem to be as happy as those who have senior classes. I venture to assert that the infant teachers have no desire to change with the more highly-favoured teachers of senior standards.

8th and 9th June, 1906:—"Infants should read more."

Our time-table of that date showed that infants got two hours' reading every day.

Same date:—"Mr. Boyd should devote a portion of his time to teaching some of the senior standards."

I have already referred to my numerous duties in my statement. The following statements of Mr. MacMillan re myself, deserve attention:—

(1) "He does not take pains to see that the assistants are employed, and the pupils taught in the most effective manner."

I think that this statement demands a searching inquiry, by some honest, unprejudiced official, as I most emphatically deny it. Above statement does not agree with that made by him in March, 1910:—"The assistants are diligent."

(2) "Training candidate monitors is no part of his duty, while the special instruction of monitors is to be done outside school hours, and Mr. Boyd is paid extra for that duty."

Who then is to train the candidate monitors and ascertain most suitable pupils for appointment? Mr. MacMillan recommended me to teach some of the senior standards. Now, when I say that I give instructions to the most advanced of the senior standards, he says that it is no part of my duty. Should we cease to keep monitors in my school, as has been done in several others, how much would be deducted from my salary?

(3) "The assistants are very seldom absent."

For year ending 31st March, 1911, there were 215 absences in the entire staff—an average of more than one per day.

(4) "In a school where good order and discipline are traditional, for which Mr. Boyd deserves every credit, misunderstandings between teachers and pupils must be very rare."

Does anyone imagine that we could obtain this order and discipline, and that without resorting to corporal punishment, in such a large, over-crowded school, if I were confined for a definite period at a definite work, or if I neglected my business, as Mr. MacMillan wants the Board to believe?

(5) "Parents generally call, I believe, before ten o'clock."

Parents call when it suits them. This happens at any time during the day, and very often both before and after school hours.

(6) "I repeat I see no reason why Mr. Boyd should not be responsible for a definite, if limited portion of the school work. I understand that in England no matter how large the school, the head teacher must take some definite portion of the teaching."

I have attempted to teach certain subjects to senior classes very often since the school became so large, but owing to continual interruptions, my efforts were wasted. He does not mention the practice in Scotland, and I think it would be as safe a model as England. Besides, the practice he mentions in England is far from being universal.

With regard to Mr. MacMillan's sneer about my lethargy as a mathematician, and that I ought to be able to do the first twenty-six propositions of first book of Euclid, I beg to state that if he had given the propositions in the ordinary way, I should not have complained. He insisted, in spite of my protests, in making constructions for the pupils, and

these of such novel and unusual shapes, that he could not possibly ascertain the pupils' knowledge. I shall here give one example:—



The figure represents the blackboard. An upright line A B was drawn close to the frame. The point C was placed near centre of blackboard, and the pupils were asked to draw from C a line equal to A B. I should like to see Mr. MacMillan solve this problem himself. I repeat now what I told Mr. MacMillan in the manager's presence, that at the examination he did not give even one plain proposition—the whole examination for these young children, whose ages range from 10 to 12 years, was a series of puzzles.

I requested my manager to complain to the Education Office about the mathematical examination, and Mr. MacMillan was sent to investigate the charges made against himself. I was able to prove to the manager's satisfaction that the examination was unfair. Mr. MacMillan at first denied that he had given any "cuts" in Euclid. I was about to bring forward my own little girl, along with others to prove my statement, when he said, "You have me there. I asked your little girl, as I saw she knew her work well, to prove 17th prop., without producing a side. What I intended as a compliment to your daughter you now use against me." I replied that I would accept the compliment, and then went on to show the absurd exercise he had given the others.

It is not true that I had been praising my daughter's mathematical attainments; I felt too much annoyed with him, for his evident intention to deprive me of all fees for my year's work, to be in a mood for conversation with him.

Mr. MacMillan thinks that as we were only at the 7th prop., on 18th February, we could not get over the course before 30th June. My experience on this subject showed me that by far the most difficult part of the work is done when definitions, axioms, postulates, and first seven propositions are well taught. He also had his opinion on the matter, and he proved that he was right to the extent of recommending that I should get no fees.

With regard to the Algebra which Mr. MacMillan mentions, I gave the questions to the manager as they had been supplied to me by the pupils, and the Inspector seems to think that as one of the questions was not correctly reported by me, I therefore had no case. Any unprejudiced person, to whom I show these questions, believes with me that they were most unfair, and were given with the object of depriving me of money which I had dearly earned. My entire fee should have been £39 15s. Mr. MacMillan, who professes great anxiety to pay me compliments, recommended that I should get nothing for my work, but on appealing to the Board I got £8 17s. 6d.

8th, 9th, and 10th March, 1919.—"The division of work is not satisfactory. There are only two teachers assigned to the infants, and I have generally found the junior infants left to senior pupils. . . . At times teachers were not employed in the most useful way. Two assistants, e.g., superintended Standard IV. at composition, but there was no teaching of the subject, each merely going through the desks and marking errors."

Mr. MacMillan notes for this date:—"I again lowered the mark to 'Good' largely on account of the unsatisfactory condition of the infant division—179 infants were again left to two teachers."

With regard to above references to infants, I beg to state that they are falsehoods. I would again refer to the average attendance of infants for March, 1910—148-1, so that he made a mistake of only 31 infants. He told me that he would lower our mark because the writing of these little children was indifferent. Two teachers had charge of these children

—one of juniors and the other seniors. Each of these assistants had two monitors as well as the help of advanced senior pupils who wish to become monitors. While the junior infants are in school, one of our most skilful and highly-qualified assistants, Miss Houston, has entire charge of them, with the help I have indicated.

With regard to the 4th Standard, a composition lesson had been given previously, and at the desk lesson referred to the teachers were seeing that the pupils remembered the lesson, by requiring them to write on the subject they had been taught. On above dates the average attendance of the class was 62. Mr. MacMillan seemed to think that these pupils should be allowed to write whatever rubbish they like, and that the teachers should attend to mistakes, &c., after school hours. If his ideas in some respects were carried out, our school home, to which several parents already object, would require to be considerably lengthened.

(5) Mr. Larnour's Reply.

While I do not regard the Inspector's criticism of the senior members of the Deputation in charge of the "Memorial from Belfast Clergymen" as in any sense a reply to the statements made in the memorial or by the deputationists, I do not think that this criticism should pass without notice.

Many of the comments now made on the work in my school are quite new to me.

Although Mr. Mangan now says:—"The oral composition of the infants was weak," neither at the time of his visit (January, 1907) nor in his "Minute," afterwards received, did he make, for the teachers' guidance, any reference to this alleged defect. Again he now says:—"Arithmetic in the standards above the fourth and needlework in all the standards were only 'Very Fair.'" But at his inspection he wrote: "The general proficiency in English is 'Very Good' in arithmetic and the other subjects taught it is 'Good.'" Further, he says:—"Practically no Elementary Science had been taught," but in the Observation Book he wrote: "There are no facilities for teaching Kindergarten nor for teaching Elementary Science."

Mr. Mangan writes:—"The dirty walls had nothing whatever to do with the mark I gave, and I don't think Mr. Larnour himself seriously believes they had."

Contrast this with what he wrote in November, 1903:—"The schoolrooms want doing up—brightening; walls are getting dingy," and in January, 1907, without the walls receiving the attention of the painter meantime, he again wrote: "The wall require to be painted, and some pictures should be got to brighten up the rooms." How can he seriously think that I didn't believe that the walls had to do with the mark he gave in face of his own observations? Mr. Mangan suggests:—"The mark would probably have been higher . . . if the Principal himself had made an honest effort to teach in the spirit of the New System, rather than follow that of the old one." He probably does not know that I devoted time and fee at Belfast Technical Institute to improve myself in these branches of drawing which had been neglected during my training under the supervision of the National Board's officers; and this occurred before the Board made a move to help teachers in the New System. When the Board did start classes in "Hand and Eye" and "Elementary Science," I attended them also. These facts enable me to set a correct value on Mr. Mangan's opinion, that my "own attitude towards it (New System) seemed to be that of a passive resister." If Mr. Mangan hold the views he now expresses, why did he not condemn my attitude and set me right in November, 1903, or in January, 1907, instead of reporting:—"The discipline of the school and the tone are excellent!"

Mr. Welby, without specifying what teacher was responsible, writes:—"I found . . . some of the written exercises inadequately corrected." The actual note he made in April, 1908, reads:—"The written exercises of III. and IV. Standards require more careful correction (Mrs. Foster's charge)." This statement was a most experienced first of first-class teacher.

Mr. Welby now says:—"Object lessons poorly taught by Misses Larnour and Brown," but his note

in January, 1909, was:—"A better response should be obtained from the junior pupils at Object Lesson."

He continues:—"The more I saw of Mr. Larnour, the more thoroughly the conviction gained upon me that he is one of the Belfast teachers who would fain throw all his own work on the shoulders of his assistants." At this time (January, 1909), my time-table arrangements were those that had been approved by Mr. Kelly, after correspondence with me, and after he had had a private interview with my manager and an assistant, to which I was not invited. It is singular that Mr. Welpy never since hinted to me that he thought the time-table arrangements were defective, and it is quite evident that Mr. Kelly after the thought he had expended on them, considered them correct and just.

Mr. Welpy quotes, from the report of the teachers' deputiation, an observation regarding inspection which was incorrectly reported, and which I corrected in the draft copy submitted to me for amendment, so that criticism under this head is futile.

Speaking generally, he says:—"With some of the junior teachers, and particularly with some of the Principals of large schools, I felt a dissatisfaction, which I expressed in each individual case to the teacher himself, and to his manager." I need only say that I was not one of those to whom Mr. Welpy so expressed himself.

Mr. Kelly writes:—"Again and again his (Mr. Larnour's) attention was directed to irregularities and defects, which he made no effort to avoid or remedy." I presume defects of equipment, which were not within my province to remedy, are those referred to, because Mr. Kelly goes on to mention matters with which I was concerned:—

(1) "Neglect to record time of arrival or departure before 4th November, 1908." Prior to this date I had not received instructions as to where and how such times were to be recorded. It is true that I had received a note in June, 1908, stating:—"It is desirable that all teachers should enter in the ordinary roll after their names, not only the times of their arrival, but also the times of their departure daily," but no instructions accompanied the note, and it was not till 4th November, 1909, that I received them.

(2) "Irregular time-table arrangements." This, I believe, refers to the subject taught from 9-45 to 10-15, the absence of which from the time-table, as I explained to Mr. Kelly, was due to my forgetting to insert it, as he recommended, and not to any conspiracy on my part.

(3) "Neglect of monitor's criticism lesson." The manager of the school (the late Very Rev. Dean Bellows) forbade the attendance of assistants at the criticism lesson.

(4) "Failure to make adequate preparation for work." No Inspector ever pointed out wherein my work showed lack of adequate preparation.

(5) "Neglect to introduce Elementary Science." I could not introduce this branch as there was no apparatus in the school.

(6) "Defective organisation was not remedied. The organisation in force was that previously approved by Mr. Kelly, and he surely did not expect that the work of the members of the staff would be changed in the middle of the school year. Each of them would very properly say it was unfair to be held responsible at end of school year for a class transferred to her in January.

(7) "Mr. Larnour made no effort to brighten the rooms with pictures or plants. This matter was referred to by five different Inspectors." Not one of these Inspectors ever hinted that I should purchase these myself, and now for the first time I learn that this is expected by Mr. Kelly. I have always understood that the Board objected to teachers spending money on the school, and I knew an instance in which the late Dr. Moran severely censured a teacher for expending money to introduce cockery to his school.

(8) "When pupils' eyes were allowed to rest on walls and window-sills, which repelled by their bareness, the atmosphere of the school was such that I could hardly command its tone." This refers to my complaint on the Deputation to the absence of any reference in my school report to "moral tone and discipline." It is apparent that the "tone" Mr. Kelly refers to is not "moral tone"; but why did he write in 1904:—"An excellent tone pervades the school," although the walls and win-

dow-sills repelled as much by the bareness at that time as they did in 1909? It is evident that he now uses the word in quite a different sense from that in which he employed it in 1904.

(9) "Kindergarten, Elementary Science, and Cockery are not taught." There was no equipment for any of these subjects, and, therefore, the teachers could not introduce them.

(6) Mr. T. R. McChuggage's Reply.

(1) The Hull Case.—Mrs. Hull asked me and other teachers, after her husband's death, if she could obtain no redress. Accordingly, when the Deputation to the Resident Commissioner was arranged, we decided that the case should be brought forward. I went to Mrs. Hull and suggested that she should write a letter, which she did, and to every word of that letter she still adheres. Mrs. Hull asserts that the incident about the boy was subsequent to the mental trouble of her husband, and was, in fact, only a result of that trouble. Mrs. Hull does not know what Mr. Kelly said in his statement to the Commissioners, but when he visited her, she told him in much plainer language that she had used in her letter, that she stood by all she had said. The fact that Mr. Hull's sister did not know the circumstances is no answer to the case. She was not in her brother's confidence, and he was most anxious that the affair should be kept from her. Mrs. Hull now states that, in addition to Dr. Melholland, Doctors Caldwell, of Belfast, and McKillop, of Creiff Hydra, can prove that Mr. Hull was in a state of mental and nervous prostration before the trouble about the boy, to which reference has been made, and she believes she has ample proof for her statement, which was read by me at the Deputation.

(2) I complained of Mr. Kelly's ungentlemanly bearing towards me. For answer he submits a testimonial from the Rev. B. Usher Green, manager of the school. Mr. Green was never once in the school when Mr. Kelly visited or inspected, and yet he feels justified in testifying to his impartiality and so forth. Mr. Kelly must have known the exact value of the evidence on which he was asking the Commissioners to base their decision.

(3) Mr. Kelly says he took no exception to my teaching the alternative programme to the 7th and 8th Standards. In a letter to the manager, he stated:—"The pupils of 6th Standard, in Nicholson Memorial School, were prepared for the Preparatory Grade (Intermediate). This is not officially authorised, and even the pupils of the 7th and 8th Standards cannot be prepared for the Intermediate without the Inspector's recommendation." And he stated to me:—"The gist of my report was that a higher mark than 'Good' could be assigned to the school, if you concentrated your energies on the work officially marked out for you." I should add that no 6th Standard pupil was prepared on the alternative programme. Intermediate pupils were always enrolled in the 7th or 8th Standard.

It appears, from what Mrs. Hull now states, that Mr. Kelly's account of his interview with her is inaccurate and misleading. In my own case I cannot conceive a greater injustice than that which Mr. Kelly has done me—in the first place by submitting a testimonial which he knew to be valueless, and in the second place by his deliberate denial of a vital matter of fact.

(7) J. M. Thomson's Reply.—(McClure Street N.S.)

Mr. Dewar says:—"I wish, however, when Mr. Thomson undertook to mention the case, he had made himself familiar with all the circumstances and placed them fully before the authorities of the Board."

Now, Mr. Dewar does not particularise any defect in what I said, and if acts and language have any meaning, he did in some way test the class referred to, as he uttered these words to Mr. Scott as soon as he had turned from it:—"That is an impossible class." Mr. Scott immediately explained that these pupils had been enrolled by him twelve or thirteen days previously; and so repudiated responsibility. Mr. Dewar replied:—"Oh! I was giving you credit for them," meaning he was laying the responsibility of what he described as an "impossible class" upon Mr. Scott.

Now, no living mortal can understand how Mr. Dewar could know that it was an "impossible

class " without applying some test which I understand he denies, neither could he assign responsibility of any kind without acquiring knowledge of the educational ability of the children; therefore every reasonable circumstance contradicts the view Mr. Dewar presents.

(a) It was the very first class he went to that day. Did he go for nothing?

(b) When leaving the class his words prove he had made an estimate of the educational abilities of the pupils, when he described them as an "impossible class."

(c) His words also proved that he had charged their defects upon Mr. Scott:—"Oh! I was giving you credit for them." "Credit" evidently was not used in its ordinary sense as the whole context shows it was "discredit" that was meant.

Mr. Dewar, on 6th February, 1911, was not prevented from correcting anything I said; indeed, he was invited to make a statement at the time, and his afterthought cannot count for much, when he allowed such a good opportunity to pass. On that day, he, in presence of the entire company, charged me with wilful misrepresentation of the truth. I instantly gave indubitable proof that he was absolutely wrong, and called upon him to withdraw his statement, and apologise for having made it. This he did at once, when I proceeded to denounce the Board's regulations which leave it open to any Inspector to charge responsibility upon a teacher for pupils enrolled in his school for a period less than six months; and urged that every school should have its own school year, enforcing this idea by a reference to the proverb, that Inspectors as well as many others should not see half-done work.

Apart from all this, I did then, and do now, strongly condemn Mr. Dewar for his unnecessary, unjust, and cruel observations about the conduct of the pupils of M'Clure Street, under the circumstances as he found them on that day. There were 119 pupils present, and teaching staff for about 60 (one assistant out sick). Comment here is needless. The man who would not feel it to be his bounden duty to take such circumstances into account, and to make due allowance, is furnishing indubitable proof that he should not be trusted with the arbitrary powers vested in Inspectors.

Before the arrival from the Junior School of these thirteen pupils, Mr. Scott had no First Standard, but by adding to these a number who previously had been with Second Standard, and who could not profit as they should from the effects of the teacher, owing to their backward state, a First Standard was regularly organised a few days before Mr. Dewar's visit. Now, every practical teacher knows the trouble and confusion inseparably connected with the introduction of an additional class, with the teaching staff as formerly, and, as I have already mentioned, an assistant was out sick, and so this class had no teacher in charge on that day, and consequently was a great contributor to the want of order which every teacher denounces; therefore, this class was reorganised by Mr. Dewar, when he unnecessarily and unnecessarily recorded his strictures about the demeanour of the pupils. Is it not remarkable that Mr. Scott, for five or six years in succession, had obtained a higher credit mark than Mr. Dewar assigned him; especially so, as looking forward to some reward for good work, he had been more than ordinary diligent? It is most remarkable also, that Mr. Dewar praises the written work of the school. Now, every man of any knowledge of school work, knows it is immeasurably harder to bring the written work to a high standard than any other work; and I challenge any man to show me written work of high order maintained in conjunction with low educational status in other branches.

I am certain the Commissioners will see that there was high degree of caution, or deep degree of cunning, in describing a teacher upon things which are passing, and at best only matters of mere opinion—actions directed by momentary fancy—while written work, which may be available as proof long hence, is spoken of as it is found.

I do not detract one word from what I said on 6th February, 1911. There is no doubt Mr. Dewar and others feel it necessary to make a defence; but throughout the whole there is no cause shown why Belfast districts should simultaneously decline in so marked a manner since 1906. If explanation

be possible not a single Inspector among the whole lot has yet given it. I am informed that only one school was raised in credit as a result of the Visit of the Chiefs-of-Inspection, and that Mr. Hynde's hand was not in the case at all. If true, how significant.

St. Jude's N.S.

I believe that three Inspectors dwell upon this case, and try through it to throw discredit on all I said. It is truly labour in vain. I never said the teacher was put out of his school in consequence of the low mark given by Inspector Dale. I take every man present on 6th February, 1911, as witness I never uttered such an absurd statement. Smaller matters mentioned by me were challenged on the spot. Mr. Hynde, who had visited the school, would have been dated to have so good a chance to show I was wrong, and would have used the occasion to urge that no trust could be placed in any statement I made. Dr. Starkie, Mr. Ward, and my six colleagues all say I made no such statement. In the first printed report of the interview on February 6th, I corrected this portion, and inserted a small slip of paper between the printed pages, upon which I wrote the true version. I cannot understand why the correction did not appear in the corrected reprint. Three Inspectors, therefore, deliberate offensive and defensive observations upon what never was uttered. Everything I said about this school and the teacher I re-affirm, and am now in a better position to prove than before. Mr. Honan refers to this case, and is evidently more anxious to prove my words false than to state the whole truth. He places it on record that he visited this school in April, 1911. That evening or the next he wrote up an account of his visit, and among other things, assured the Education Office that Mr. Cotter was in good health, and so I must have stated an untruth. Mr. Honan did visit the school, addressed Mr. Cotter in an unusually bland style, complimented him upon his healthy appearance, and in friendly manner inquired about his health. Mr. Cotter was able to assure him he was well, but little knew he was drawing upon him to furnish proof that I had not spoken the truth. Now, Mr. Cotter's health in April, 1911, is no guide to what it was twelve months previously, when, after the lowering of his Report by Inspector Dale, he was so mortified that his health became impaired, his sleep and rest were broken, and almost his heart also, when he found it necessary to consult the doctor, and employ other means of recuperation. It was in connection with this case I challenged Mr. Hynde to give one instance in all the districts, of which Belfast is the centre, where any teacher ever gained by an appeal to him. Mr. Hynde hesitated to reply, but I insisted upon an answer in presence of Dr. Starkie and the whole company, when he was compelled to say he could not give one. This incident shows up the value of an appeal.

Mr. Honan says:—"None of the statements made by Mr. Thomson refer to me, but I beg to refer to two of them which I know to be false."

From page 17 of the Report, Mr. Honan quotes as follows:—"Again," he said, "I will mention a matter that concerns him (Mr. Dewar). In August or September last, about six weeks after I had promoted the children, I received the papers to fill up for the next day," etc.

I did not say I received the papers to fill up for the next day. I knew quite well the papers were not wanted for next day. I said I had received the papers to fill up for the next examination, a very different thing; besides, I assigned no blame to Mr. Dewar in this connection, he only did what the Board's rules allow him to do, but I used this instance to declaim against the absurdity of the Board's rules. All I said under this head on 6th February I am prepared to repeat, and much more in addition. Mr. Honan goes on to say:—"Now, I was present in the school when the Returns arrived." This is absolutely untrue. He was not in my school when the Returns arrived, and seemed somewhat surprised when I told him they had been forwarded. Mr. Honan then comments about six weeks, a period of time I am represented as mentioning in this connection, and labours the matter to establish my inaccuracy. Now, I am as nearly correct as he is. Promotions are directed from 1st July each year. Belfast schools are almost all on holidays in July.

I was closed up to second Monday in August, so that takes away five weeks, and six weeks after actual promotions, and you are eleven weeks along as my statement was. "After I had promoted"; but strange to say, in reply to questions, I actually informed the whole company I was not speaking definitely, but only used my own experience as an opportunity to speak against the present unjust and absurd method of examination or inspection.

Mr. Homan, in his statement exhibits a malicious virulence in his style, but in almost every instance lays himself open to easy refutation.

As to my "rude habit of contradicting at right angles," etc., I have conversed with all classes of men from the Prime Minister through all grades of society and degrees of culture down (even) to Mr. Homan, and never yet did anyone read repulsion in the countenance of any of them, but quite the reverse; and as to Mr. Homan's observation that "he said nothing," I can only say that a man who has few ideas acts wisely by husbanding them. Further on Mr. Homan makes me say, "We have beaten them on that point," meaning cockery. I here declare I never used such words to Mr. Homan in my life. This is one of his untruths virulently set.

(COPY.)

Office of National Education,
Dublin, 2nd June, 1911.

Sir—The Commissioners have had before them the report of the Deputation of the Belfast Teachers' Association, received on 9th February, 1911, together with the observations of the Inspectors whose conduct has been impugned.

Having carefully considered in all their aspects, the difficult questions involved, the Commissioners are of opinion that, while in view of the facts disclosed the teachers were justified in appealing to them, there is no evidence to show that there has been any concerted action on the part of the administration to deal severely with the Belfast teachers, or that the present standard of marking is unduly high in their schools. Doubtless, the returns indicate that some of the Inspectors now in Belfast are stricter than their predecessors, but, on the other hand, there is evidence that for five or six years subsequently to 1906 the standard of marking, at any rate in the County Down, was unduly low, as compared with other parts of Ireland. Consequently the discrepancy of marking in late years, to which the teachers draw attention, is not so surprising as might appear on the surface.

The Commissioners recognise the ability with which the teachers' case was represented, but, after careful investigation, they consider that the colour given to some of the incidents cited, and the imputations made by some members of the Deputation are devoid of any justification.

The views of the Commissioners on the subject of the relations they desire to subsist between the Inspectors and the teachers have been fully stated by the Resident Commissioner in his address of August 30th, 1900, from which the Deputation quoted, and in his replies to the Deputation, which the Commissioners accept as the best possible statement of their policy. They regret that it appears from the present inquiry that these relations are not as cordial as they would wish; and they hope that it will be possible to place them upon a better footing. The Deputation complain that all independence in the teacher is crushed by the present system of inspection. This charge has much surprised the Commissioners. Since 1900, their desire has been to foster in the teacher a high spirit of self-respect and independence, upon which, as they are aware, his moral influence over the pupils must mainly depend. The present system of inspection was designed for the purpose of cultivating these qualities. Since, however, the result does not appear as yet fully to answer to the aim of the Commissioners, they are taking further steps whereby their policy shall be more adequately realised, and carried into effect—I am, Sir, your obedient servant

W. J. DUNWORTH, Secretary.

William Knight, Esq.,

Hon. Secretary of the Belfast Teachers' Association,
55 Rosemount Gardens, Belfast.

(COPY.)

55 Rosemount Gardens.

Belfast Teachers' Association,
Whitehall Buildings, Ann Street,
Belfast, 24-6-11.

To the Secretaries,

Office of National Education.

GENTLEMEN—I am instructed by the Belfast Teachers' Association to submit the following reply for your consideration:—

We regret that it is necessary to express our disappointment with your letter of 2nd inst.

The admitted simultaneous lowering of reports in the Belfast Circuits, viewed in connection with the raising of them in other parts of Ireland, is sufficient proof that there has been concerted action, and that the standard has been unduly raised.

Take, for example, the case of Mr. Kelly, who has been in Belfast the entire time covered by the returns, to which we referred in proof of our statements. He lowered more reports than any other Inspector of whom we have a record. In this case we are not comparing his reports with those of his predecessors, but with those furnished by himself.

The Commissioners state that there is no evidence of concerted action on the part of the administration to lower reports, yet in the next sentence say that for five or six years subsequent to 1906, the standard of marking in Co. Down was unduly low.

Who discovered this state of affairs? Why were five or more years necessary to this discovery? What evidence is there that the more recent standard is the correct one, or that it is in unison with any of the standards set up in other Circuits? This admission by the Commissioners, of change of standard, is a condemnation of the present system, and proves concerted action on the part of the administration. Now that the standard (if, indeed, there be any definite standard) is unduly high in County Down, why has no action been taken?

In the appendix to the 76th Report for 1908-9, Mr. MacMillan recorded the number of schools getting the different kinds of reports.

He gave no school "Excellent," although for the same year 3.5 per cent. of the schools of all Ireland got that mark. He gave 5.4 per cent. of the schools "Very Good," while for the same year 23.3 per cent. of the schools in the rest of Ireland got that or the higher mark. He gave 48.5 per cent. "Fair," and 6.3 per cent. "Satisfactory" or "Bad," while in all Ireland the corresponding figures were only 28.1 per cent. and 4.7 per cent. respectively.

It seems inexplicable that action was taken to remove the Inspectors who were alleged to have been unduly lenient, but none taken to remove those who were unduly severe.

The same character of severity appears to follow Mr. MacMillan wherever he goes. Some years ago teachers publicly thanked your Board for removing him and expressed sympathy with the Circuit to which he was removed.

The strangest feature of this state of affairs is that Mr. Kelly, of whom we complain seriously, was one of the Inspectors in County Down during the time of the alleged leniency.

In view of these facts, the discrepancies in marking seem more surprising than ever, and teachers wonder why just and honourable men permit such a state of affairs to continue.

Teachers are also surprised that the Commissioners before taking the word of the Inspectors, whose conduct has been called in question, and pronouncing judgment, did not give an opportunity of proving the statements contravened by the Inspectors.

For example, we have been informed that Mr. Dewar denies having spoken disparagingly of the work of Belfast teachers. We are prepared to produce evidence to show that he did so, not only to teachers, but to managers. One manager, a J.P., is quite willing to prove this statement. Again it was pointed out that he had left observations, recommending that wash-hand basins should be provided in schools where either a lavatory or baths, with towels and soap, were already furnished. We are prepared with undoubted proofs of this statement. In another case he complained about the want of a globe and kindergarten material, where both had been provided; we are prepared to prove our aversion. Facts were stated which have

not been denied, and we are therefore surprised that merely on the word of those implicated it should be said that after careful investigation the inaccuracies made by some members of the Deputation are without justification.

The members of the Deputation adhere to all that they stated, are convinced of the truth of every statement made by them, and are prepared to tender proof, if opportunity be afforded.

The only investigation we are aware of was that by Messrs. Hynes and Purser, which only dealt with lowering of the marks in a few schools.

Since the Resident Commissioner and the Secretaries stated explicitly that no direction to raise the standard in the Belfast Circuits, was issued by the Board, we are forced to conclude that Mr. Hynes was responsible for the circumstances which compelled us to appeal to the Commissioners, and hence we regard his mission of investigation as nothing but a mockery of our complaint. He was simply reporting on himself, and would naturally attempt to defend his own conduct.

In law courts appeals are frequently successful, but we are not aware of a case where, on appeal, a teacher has received any redress. The decisions of Inspectors appear as unalterable as the laws of the Medes and Persians.

It was alleged that because no appeals had been made no injustice had, therefore, been felt. Upwards of 200 teachers have now appealed against what they consider unjust decisions, and no redress is granted. This is sufficient to show the futility of appeals.

We know able, industrious, conscientious teachers, who have been doing their utmost, and yet are severely penalised, and can obtain no relief. We hoped that justice would be done to those deserving teachers who have been deprived of increments and promotion, but we are sadly disappointed. Under such circumstances it is cause for wonder that a rankling sense of injustice is prevalent among teachers.

In the large majority of cases, there is little change in the merit of a school from year to year, and the chopping and changing up and down between "Excellent" and "Good," or between "Very Good" and "Fair," is very distressing to teachers, and is proof positive of the inability of some Inspectors to estimate correctly a teacher's work.

The Commissioners promise to take steps to have their policy carried out. We fear, under the present staff of Inspectors in Belfast, there is little prospect of redress.

So long as Mr. Hynes is at the head of the Inspection in these Circuits, we have little hope of any improvement.

We again appeal to the Board to grant redress to those teachers, who have been unjustly, as we believe, deprived of increments and promotion by men who have been acting contrary to the desires of the Commissioners, as expressed in their recent circular.—I am, Gentlemen, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM KNIGHT, Hon. Secretary.

APPENDIX XLVII.

LIST OF SCHOOLS WITH MARKS AND INSPECTORS' NAMES SENT TO BELFAST
INQUIRY COMMITTEE.

(Handed in by Mr. O. H. Todd, Principal, Ballynacorney Road, N.S., Belfast)

LIST OF SCHOOLS WITH MARKS AND INSPECTORS

No.	School.	Roll No.	1901.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.
1	Lambeg	8079	G. Mr. Pedlow.	G. Mr. Scaple.	G. Mr. O'Connell.	VG Mr. O'Connell.	VG Mr. O'Connell.
2	Amperstone	9392	—	—	—	—	—
3	Millers	11483	F. Mr. MacKenna.	G. Mr. Barclay.	G. Mr. Chambers.	G. Mr. Chambers.	G. Mr. Chambers.
4	Ballybegs (formerly Bally- willy)	4257	G. Mr. O'Connell.	G. Mr. Murphy.	No report	VG Mr. Yates.	VG Mr. Yates.
5	Shan Street	15624	—	G. Mr. Scaple.	VG Mr. O'Connell.	VG. Mr. O'Connell.	VG Mr. O'Connell.
7	St. Malachy's, Boys' ...	15251	G. Mr. Chambers.	G. Mr. Chambers.	G. Mr. Barclay.	G. Mr. Kelly.	G. Mr. Kelly.
9	Camakara	1861	—	—	—	—	—
10	Salisbury	11832	—	G. Dr. Moran.	K. Mr. Morgan.	VG Mr. Barclay.	VG Mr. Kelly.
11	Nicholas Memorial ...	15824	—	E. Mr. Chambers.	K. Mr. O'Connell.	K. Mr. O'Connell.	K. Mr. O'Connell.
12	Garraghy, West	4605	F. Dr. Barclay.	F. Mr. Wyse.	—	G. Mr. MacMahon.	G. Mr. MacMahon.
14	Lauricvale	18290	—	G. Mr. Barclay.	F. Mr. Barclay.	VG Mr. Kelly.	G. Mr. Kelly.
15	Loverogor	2030	G. Mr. Robinson.	F. Mr. Ross.	F. Mr. Chambers.	VG Mr. Ross.	VG Mr. Ross.
16	Obvot	18739	—	—	G. Mr. Ross.	G. Mr. Ross.	G. Mr. Ross.
18	Winder and Workman Memorial.	3001	—	G. Mr. Scaple.	G. Mr. O'Connell.	G. Mr. O'Connell.	G. Mr. O'Connell.
19	St. Joseph's, Girls', Bally- hackamore.	14134	F. Mr. Little.	G. Mr. Barclay.	E. Mr. Little.	VG. Mr. Chambers.	VG. Mr. Chambers.
20	Edford Street, Infant ...	13089	G. Mr. Ross.	G. Mr. Ross.	G. Mr. Scaple.	VG. Mr. Scaple.	VG. Mr. Scaple.
21	Snaggle	12708	F. Mr. Chambers.	G. Mr. Chambers.	VG. Mr. Kelly.	VG. Mr. Kelly.	VG. Mr. Kelly.
22	Ballymorney Street, Boys'	12509	F. Mr. Clements.	F. Mr. Glover.	—	G. Mr. Horan.	G. Mr. Horan.
23	St. Donard's	12737	—	—	VG Mr. Chambers.	VG Mr. Chambers.	VG Mr. Chambers.
24	Ballydow, Sydenham ...	12134	Ballydow N.S. VG. Mr. Little.	E. Mr. Smyth.	G. Mr. Chambers.	VG Mr. Chambers.	VG Mr. Chambers.
25	Cobars	14632	G. Mr. Yates.	F. Mr. Murphy.	F. Mr. Yates.	VG Mr. Yates.	VG Mr. Yates.
26	St. Matthew's	10806	F. Mr. Chambers.	G. Mr. Chambers.	G. Mr. Kelly.	G. Mr. Kelly.	G. Mr. Kelly.
28	Shorrogh	10808	—	—	—	—	—
29	Brown Street	8721	F. Mr. Kelly.	G. Mr. Clements.	G. Mr. Barclay.	VG Mr. Ross.	VG Mr. Ross.
30	Alexandra	18198	G. Mr. O'Connell.	E. Mr. Chambers.	No Mark, Pres. W.I.	VG Mr. Kelly.	VG Mr. Kelly.
31	Ashmore Street	9463	—	G. Mr. Clements.	G. Mr. Kelly.	VG Mr. O'Connell.	VG Mr. O'Connell.
32	Kilgarry	—	—	—	—	—	—
33	McClure Street	13268	—	—	—	—	—
35	Ravenhill Road	15889	—	—	—	—	—
34	Chlor Park, No. 1	11974	—	G. Mr. Chambers.	G. Mr. Barclay.	VG Mr. Kelly.	VG Mr. Kelly.
35	Westbourne, Senior ...	12924	F. Mr. Little.	G. Mr. Barclay.	E. Mr. Morgan.	E. Mr. Barclay.	E. Mr. Kelly.
36	Agass Street, Mixed ...	13329	—	E. Mr. Ross.	E. Mr. Scaple.	VG Mr. Scaple.	VG Mr. Scaple.
37	St. Mark's N.S.	11469	E. Mr. O'Connell.	E. Mr. Chambers.	E. Mr. Little.	E. Mr. Kelly.	E. Mr. Kelly.
38	Anasero', Boys'	1244	—	G. Mr. Ross.	G. Mr. Scaple.	VG Mr. Scaple.	VG Mr. Scaple.
40	Rhythe Street	13161	—	G. Mr. Scaple.	G. Mr. Kelly.	G. Mr. O'Connell.	G. Mr. O'Connell.
41	Bright	4764	—	—	—	—	—
42	Castlewellan, No. 2 ...	7486	G. Mr. Ross.	G. Mr. Ross.	G. Mr. Scaple.	VG Mr. Scaple.	VG Mr. Scaple.
43	Strangford	7321	—	—	—	—	—
44	Barna	10406	F. Mr. Kelly.	G. Mr. Ross.	G. Mr. Scaple.	VG Mr. Scaple.	VG Mr. Scaple.
45	Victoria Street, Lurgan, Co. Antrim	15020	F. Mr. Murphy.	VG Mr. Yates.	—	—	—
46	Glennel Boys', Antrim	12157	G. Mr. Robinson.	G. Mr. Clements.	F. Mr. Glover.	G. Mr. Horan.	G. Mr. Horan.

No.	School.	Roll No.	1901.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.
47	Ballymancy Street, Girls', Ballymanna.	12505	G Mr. Clements.	G. Mr. Clements.	G Mr. Heenan.	F. Mr. Heenan.	F. Mr. Heenan.
48	Ballymough, Co. Down	3224	— —	G Mr. Kelly.	VG Mr. Ross.	Ex. Mr. Ross.	Ex. Mr. Ross.
49	St. Aidan's, Girls', Down	11704	— —	G. Mr. Ross.	Ex. Mr. Sample.	Ex. Mr. Sample.	Ex. Mr. Sample.
50	Cresgate, Co. Down	225	G. Mr. Kelly.	Ex. Mr. Kelly.	Ex. Mr. Bartley.	Ex. Mr. Ross.	Ex. Mr. Ross.
51	Donacavanagh, Down	5078	— —	— —	— —	— —	— —
52	St. Teresa's, Co. Antrim	10313	— —	— —	— —	— —	— —
53	Cregagh	10212	G Mr. Smyth.	Ex Mr. Bartley.	VG. Mr. Chambers.	VG. Mr. Chambers.	VG. Mr. Chambers.
54	Woodburn, No. 1 Carnegie	14740	— —	Ex. Mr. Bartley.	G. Mr. Benson.	G. Mr. Bartley.	G. Mr. Kelly.
55	Arncliffe, Girls', Down	1436	G. Mr. Ross.	G Mr. Ross.	G. Mr. Sample.	VG Mr. Sample.	VG Mr. Sample.
56	Rodon Street	10797	— —	— —	— —	— —	— —
57	Drumlin, Co. Down	3396	F. Mr. Hughes.	F. Mr. Stokes.	F. Mr. Kelly.	F. Mr. O'Connell.	F. Mr. O'Connell.
58	Lisnavea, Co. Down	10913	— —	G. Mr. Kelly.	G. Mr. Ross.	G. Mr. Bartley.	G. Mr. Ross.
59	Killybegs, Co. Cavan	14333	— —	— —	— —	— —	— —
60	St. Joseph's, Girls', Ard- ghas.	8813	G. Mr. Kelly.	G Mr. Kelly.	F. Mr. Ross.	F. Mr. Ross.	F. Mr. Ross.
61	St. Andrew's, Boys'	11703	— —	F. Mr. Sample.	G. Mr. Sample.	G. Mr. Sample.	G. Mr. Sample.
62	Ourie, Boys'	10618	G. Mr. Bartley.	G. Mr. Kelly.	VG Mr. Ross.	VG Mr. Ross.	VG Mr. Ross.
63	Waringstown, Girls'	11330	— —	— —	— —	— —	— —
64	Ballygowley, Co. Down	2931	— —	G. Mr. Kelly.	G. Mr. Ross.	G. Mr. Ross.	G. Mr. Ross.
65	Portavale No. 1, Down	11038	F. Mr. M'Elvaine.	G. Mr. Bartley.	F. Mr. Chambers.	G. Mr. Chambers.	G. Mr. Chambers.
66	Ballynalin, Co. Down	206	VG. Mr. M'Elvaine.	VG. Mr. Hanna.	G. Mr. Chambers.	G. Mr. Chambers.	G. Mr. Chambers.
67	Dundonald, Boys'	15117	G. Mr. Little.	VG. Mr. Bartley.	VG. Mr. Chambers.	VG. Mr. Chambers.	VG. Mr. Chambers.
68	Magheracowan, Co. Down	5954	G. Mr. Heenan.	G. Mr. Bartley.	G. Mr. Chambers.	G. Mr. Chambers.	G. Mr. Chambers.
69	Dunover, Co. Down	16038	— —	Ex. Dr. Moran.	G. Mr. Chambers.	G. Mr. Chambers.	G. Mr. Chambers.
70	Glenties, Co. Down	15740	— —	— —	— —	— —	— —
71	Mountstewart	15758	— —	— —	— —	— —	— —
72	Londonerry, Boys'	12880	G. Mr. M'Elvaine.	Ex. Mr. Bartley.	VG. Mr. Chambers.	Ex. Mr. Chambers.	Ex. Mr. Chambers.
73	O'Kelly Memorial Woodvale	15417 18881	F. Mr. Chambers.	F. Mr. Chambers.	VG. Mr. R. J. Kelly.	G. Mr. Keith.	G. Mr. Keith.
74	Derrybarna, Girls', Co. Antrim	12406	— —	— —	— —	— —	— —
75	Ballymough, Co. Down	240	Ex. Mr. Hughes.	Ex. Mr. Murphy.	Ex. Mr. Yates.	Ex. Mr. Yates.	Ex. Mr. Yates.
76	Edenham Street	—	— —	— —	— —	— —	— —
77	Ballymacarrett Road	40647	Ex. Mr. Young.	Ex. Mr. Hanna.	VG. Mr. Chambers.	VG. Mr. Chambers.	VG. Mr. Chambers.
78	Lisburn Free	10634	— —	G. Mr. Chambers.	G. Mr. O'Connell.	G. Mr. O'Connell.	G. Mr. O'Connell.
79	Drumgilly, Co. Down	10635	— —	G. Mr. Kelly.	G. Mr. Ross.	G. Mr. Bartley.	G. Mr. Ross.
80	Inch, Down	12561	— —	— —	— —	— —	— —
81	Ballymacarrett	14612	G. Mr. M'Elvaine.	Ex. Mr. Bartley.	Ex. Mr. Clements.	Ex. Mr. Bartley.	Ex. Mr. Kelly.
82	Seal, Down	10263	G. Mr. Kelly.	G. Mr. Kelly.	G. Mr. Ross.	VG. Mr. Ross.	Ex. Mr. Ross.
83	Cloughwater	7124	— —	— —	— —	— —	— —
84	Tecomanagh	15312	— —	G. Mr. Kelly.	VG. Mr. Ross.	Ex. Mr. Ross.	Ex. Mr. Ross.
85	Shettinstown Infant	10660	G. Mr. Young.	Ex. Mr. Bartley.	VG. Mr. Chambers.	VG. Mr. Chambers.	VG. Mr. Chambers.
86	Ballymaglave	6312	— —	G. Mr. Kelly.	G. Mr. Sample.	G. Mr. Sample.	G. Mr. Sample.
87	St. Marcellus	13183	VG. Mr. O'Connell.	VG. Mr. Chambers.	Ex. Mr. Bartley.	VG. Mr. Keith.	Ex. Mr. Keith.
88	Queen Victoria	12434	— —	G. Mr. Kelly.	G. Mr. Ross.	G. Mr. Ross.	G. Mr. Ross.

APPENDIX XLVIII.

(Handed in by Mr. C. H. Todd, Principal, Ballymacarrett Road N.S., Belfast.)

Belfast, 15/10/10.

DEAR MR. TODD—You did hesitate about presenting your pupils for fees in Algebra and Arithmetic, on the grounds that they were indifferently prepared.

The pupils in 5th Standard course (1st year) answered 34 questions out of 75, adding 30 per cent. makes 43, 75, or 56 per cent. for which only half fees are payable.

In the case of 6th Standard course (second year)

the answering was not so good. In both courses, I gave the easiest questions, and in addition added 20 per cent. to the answering, so that it was only by straining every point in your favour I was able to recommend anything. There is nothing for me to set right.—I am, yours faithfully,

P. J. HONAN.

Mr. Charles H. Todd.

APPENDIX XLIX.

(Handed in by Mr. C. H. Todd, Principal, Ballymacarrett Road N.S., Belfast.)

Office of National Education.

Dublin, 12th July, 1911.

SIR—Referring to your letter of 23rd May in which you ask what percentage is required to obtain full fees, three-quarter fees, and half-fees, in both sections of Mathematics when taught as an Extra Subject, I am directed by the Commissioners of National Education to inform you that the question of fees for Mathematics is not governed by percentages, but that if the instruction is considered effective and the progress of the pupils satisfactory, a grant of the full fee for each member of the class in bona-fide attendance may be made. If the

soundness and quality of the instruction do not appear to reach the standard "Good," but the standard "Fair" only, a half-fee per pupil in bona-fide attendance may be made. If the instruction falls below the standard of "Fair," no award of fees can be made.—I am, sir, your obedient servant,

P. E. LEMASS,
Secretary.

Wm. Knight, Esq.,

Hon. Secretary,

Belfast Teachers' Association,

Whitehall Buildings,

Ann Street, Belfast.

APPENDIX L.

(Handed by Mr. D. Elliott, B.A., Treasurer, Irish National Teachers Organization.)

INSTRUCTIONS IN REGARD TO THE INFLECTION OF CORPORAL PUNISHMENT IN NATIONAL SCHOOLS.

1. Corporal punishment should be administered only for grave transgressions—never for failure in lessons.

2. The principal teacher only should inflict corporal punishment. An interval of at least ten minutes should elapse between the offence and the punishment.

3. Only a light cane or rod may be used for the purpose of inflicting corporal punishment. The boxing of children's ears, the pulling of their hair, and similar ill-treatment are absolutely forbidden, and will be visited with severe penalties.

4. No teacher should carry about a cane or other instrument of punishment.

5. Frequent recourse to corporal punishment will be considered by the Commissioners as indicating bad tone and ineffective discipline.

6. The particulars required by the headings should be entered in this Book before the infliction of punishment.

7. The principal teacher must submit the Book to the managers on the occasion of his first visit to the school after every case of punishment.

P. E. LEMASS, } Secretaries.
W. J. DELWORTH. }Office of National Education,
Marlboro' Street, Dublin.

APPENDIX LI.

(Handed in by Mr. T. Jamison, B.A., Principal, Madrid Street N.S., Belfast.)

1. Deputation re Undergraded Teachers, 28th August, 1911.

CASE II.

Mountpottinger House,
Belfast, 29th June, 1912.Madrid St. N.S.
Roll No. 14020.
County Down.

8999.

The Under Secretary,
Dublin Castle.

SIR—As manager of above school, I have read carefully the Report of the National Board's Accountant on this case, and the teacher's rejoinder thereto,

which I enclose herewith; and I would desire to make a few observations on the matter especially on the question of inspection as it affects the issue.

I may first state that along with many school managers in Belfast, I have been much perplexed at the simultaneous and unaccountable lowering of school reports by the Board's inspectors during the last four or five years. Without the slightest apparent reason, these officials have lowered the "merit marks" of some hundreds of schools in the Belfast circuits. As it is scarcely possible that so many schools in one area could all at once decline in efficiency, this reduction of marks must have been due to some other cause, I would say, instructions from headquarters. The accompanying "rejoinder" will give some idea of the state of affairs in connection with school inspection in Belfast at the present time.

In dealing with the record of Mr. Jamieson, I observe his personal mark was lowered by the late senior inspector, Mr. Dewar, in 1908. Now, before discussing the question of the teacher's efficiency, it might be profitable to examine Mr. Dewar's character for veracity and probity, as it is largely on this ex-official's reports, that the case against Mr. Jamieson's claims, so far as the latter's official record is concerned, mainly rests. Reading at page 5 of the pamphlet, I find Mr. Dewar denies having said that "the teachers in the North know nothing about teaching," yet he actually made this observation, as is recorded in the pamphlet, to myself. I observe, further, he boasted that he had told a junior inspector (Mr. Fenton) to lower away at the reports, so long as he had him (Mr. Dewar) at his back. Just think of it! The senior inspector telling the inexperienced unattached junior, before the latter entered the schools, to lower the reports, and he, the senior, would support him. If a manager or teacher appealed against the action of the junior inspector in reducing the merit mark, the appeal was decided by Mr. Dewar who had given the instructions to lower. Could anything be more farcical? Mr. Fenton, presumably acting on this abominable advice, lowered the report of this school in 1908, and it has never since been raised. Mr. Dewar's duplicity in dealing with my appeal against Mr. Cole's report in 1910, calls for no comment from me. I would simply emphasize the fact that he never attempted to deny having said to Mr. Jamieson: "When the inspector comes he'll give you a 'Good' report."

Mr. Dewar, from my experience of him, was unreliable to a degree, and I consider it would be most unjust to deprive Mr. Jamieson of any emoluments, because of his (Mr. Dewar's) reports. In justice to the Commissioners, however, I may here state that notwithstanding Mr. Dewar's action in connection with the appeal referred to above, a small increase of grade salary was awarded to Mr. Jamieson from the date of his appointment as principal.

The superseding of the local inspector, Mr. Homan, who certainly was never suspected of undue leniency to teachers, and the sending of men like Messrs. Cole and MacMillan who would be likely to keep down the report, are adverted to by Mr. Jamieson. Mr. MacMillan's character is sufficiently well set forth in the pamphlet and correspondence therein, and for Mr. Cole's reputation, I would direct your attention to the appended resolutions of National teachers who had experience of him before he came here.

I am surely entitled to ask: Who sent these men to inspect this school, and why were they sent if not for the express purpose of keeping down the merit mark? Are the Commissioners of National Education cognisant of Mr. Dewar's advice to Mr. Fenton to lower reports, and can any inspector still issue instructions to his subordinates either to lower or keep down reports, with impunity? Is it competent for any official to send certain inspectors to certain schools in order to keep reports low?

I am strongly of opinion that reports procured in such a manner, as I submit, these last reports were procured, cannot justly be urged against the teacher now.

A school and its staff are either efficient or inefficient. The subjects taught in this school are:—Reading, writing, spelling, grammar, composition, geography, history, arithmetic, drawing, singing, needlework, elementary science, nature study, cookery and drill.

The teaching staff consists of the principal (Mr. Jamieson) and three assistants, all highly qualified according to the rules of the National Board. Now I would direct your special attention to the appended report, the last I have received on this school, and invite an expression of opinion from the Irish Government as to the efficiency of the school and the staff.

As to the value to be attached to the "merit marks" a comparison of this report with that given to a neighbouring school, and marked "Good," a copy of which I also forward herewith, will surely be interesting.

I may point out that according to the Board's latest circular of instructions to inspectors, an inspector below the rank of senior, cannot of his own accord, change a merit mark, but must first obtain the sanction of the latter officer, and that, therefore, the line of least resistance for a district or junior inspector is simply to repeat the mark of the previous year.

Regarding the question of the teacher's emoluments, I observe that the Chief Secretary stated in the House of Commons that the undergraded teachers were not suffering financially by the changes of 1900; but the Board's accountant now states that Mr. Jamieson is losing some £10 annually, while the latter alleges that the amount of the deficit is much larger. An actuary of repute could soon settle the point at issue, and if the emoluments of this teacher be not now fixed on an equitable basis according to the suspended scale, from the date of his appointment as principal, then surely Mr. Burrell's statement should be openly and unreservedly withdrawn.—I am, sir, your obedient servant,

W. GIBSON, M.D., J.P.
Manager.

(Enclosure 1.)

REPORT OF MR. KEITH, "FAIL."

II. The work of instruction is hampered by congestion. The teachers are earnest and make preparation. Junior writing and senior singing are decidedly good in quality, but grammar and geography in fifth and sixth standards are unsatisfactory, while arithmetic generally is fair. Reading would improve if the teachers of the lower standards insisted upon the children imitating patterns distinctly and impressively read for them.

Stricter discipline should be maintained, and the children should not be allowed to adopt lazy attitudes at desk exercises.

There is a good supply of desks, but the seats of three in one room are too far from the desks.

(Enclosure 2.)

REPORT OF MR. DEWAR ON BAILLIEGABBERT ROAD N.S., BELFAST.

I. General condition of school "Good."

II. Inspector's remarks upon the result of the inspection of the school.

The school is much overcrowded; the classrooms are unsuitable and badly ventilated, and the desk accommodation is so limited that the infant pupils receive scarcely any instruction or lessons in them. Under such circumstances high-class work cannot be done. Arithmetic is only fair, and oral composition has not received sufficient practice. More attention should be given to the posture of the pupils at writing lessons.

Reading has been carefully taught. The singing of the classes was satisfactory, while the order and discipline were very commendable.

(Enclosure 3.)

RESOLUTION OF TIPPERRARY ASSOCIATION (5TH MARCH, 1910).

"That believing that Mr. Cole, Junior Inspector, has not treated the teachers of this district with courtesy and justice, we respectfully request the Commissioners to hold an inquiry into the inspection work he has made in the district."

(Enclosure 4.)

RESOLUTION OF WEST CLARE ASSOCIATION (23RD APRIL, 1910).

"We beg to bring under the notice of the Commissioners that grave dissatisfaction exists in our district at the conduct of a young Junior Inspector, Mr. Cole, who was recently doing temporary duty here, and who in almost every instance reduced, in the school inspected by him, the reports of previous Senior and District Inspectors—educational experts of the highest reputation."

2. UNDERGRADED TEACHERS' CASES.

MR. JAMIESON'S REJUNCTION (CASE II.) TO REPORT OF NATIONAL BOARD'S ACCOUNTANT.

(Official Number 8090).

The fact that I was only an assistant teacher when the change of system took place in 1900, is scarcely relevant to a consideration of my claim as an undergraded teacher. I am one of the 2,569 principal

teachers to whom Mr. Birrell referred in his reply to Mr. Hackett, M.P., in the House of Commons, on 13th July, 1910, when he stated that the fact of these teachers being undergraded did not imply that they were in a worse position either in rank or emolument than they would have been under the system which prevailed prior to 1909.

Under that system I claimed that my emoluments would have amounted approximately to a sum greater by £40 or £50 per annum than my present income. The Board's accountant acknowledges that my income is not as large as it would have been under the old system, notwithstanding the Chief Secretary's statement quoted above, but states that the disadvantage is only £8 12s. per annum. He arrives at this conclusion by calculating my probable results fees on a very low basis, and rejecting my claim to an equivalent of the total Residual Capitalisation Grant. I shall deal first with his estimate of results fees.

He evidently calculates that 140 pupils would make the necessary 100 attendances to qualify for admission to the results examination, and estimates the average fee at 15s. per pupil. To this I reply that a much larger number would likely qualify; in 1909 the last year of the results system, the number thus qualified was 184 which was about 20 per cent. higher than the average attendance. As the average of the school for the last calendar year was 140, it would be reasonable to assume that about 168 or 170 would now qualify.

Mr. Naish's estimate of average fee (15s.) is much too low. In 1900 it was 16s. 8d. My results fees, therefore, calculated on these bases would amount to at least £24. My original estimate of £60 was, therefore, not an extravagant one, especially in view of the fact that, for a long number of years prior to 1900 when the attendance was slightly larger than at present the principal's share of results fees varied from £59 to £68 or £67.

(I deal with Mr. Naish's observations re Reports, at a later stage).

Mr. Naish doesn't admit my claim to the totality of the Residual Capitalisation Grant, alleging as his reason that the Commissioners have decided that assistants are to share in this grant. To this I reply that the entire of this grant would have been included in my "emoluments" had the old system continued, and, therefore, according to Mr. Birrell's statement, I am entitled to an equivalent of the total amount. I may further remark that in 1900, in many instances, a portion of this grant was calculated along with results fees and class salary in estimating the new grade salary, with the result that many low-classed teachers were at once placed in the higher grades.

I am entitled, therefore, to claim that my emoluments should not be less than the total of the following:—

	£	s.	d.	
(a)	53	12	0	Class Salary.
(b)	36	0	0	Equivalent of Results Fees.
(c)	40	0	0	Equivalent of Residual Capitalisation Grant.
(d)	10	0	0	Augmentation Grant.
	139	12	0	

Whereas at present my income is only about £120. If my emoluments be not fixed on a more equitable basis, surely Mr. Birrell's statement, made on the authority of the Commissioners of National Education, cannot be said to be correct. The very fact that the Board's Accountant admits a deficit, however small, in my salary is a sufficient justification of my action in claiming redress.

Mr. Naish, in calculating my probable results fees includes local rates, so it is scarcely necessary to reply to his observations regarding contributory and non-contributory Poor Law Unions. I may, however, mention that the Belfast Poor Law Board, actually proposed to pay their quota as usual in 1900, after the results system had been abolished, but the Commissioners informed them that they had no authority to receive the money.

In dealing with Mr. Naish's strictures regarding my reports, and the probable effects of these records on my income and promotion had the old system continued, it will be necessary for me to make a few observations of a more or less personal character regarding the officials who furnished those reports,

and also to refer to some of the abuses to which the system of inspection, as at present administered, too readily adapts itself.

My records since 1900, according to Mr. Naish, seem to be as follow: (I take the liberty of adding the name and rank of the inspector in each case):—

	Assistant	Inspector	Rank
1900	"Fairly satisfactory"	Mr. Little	Jurist.
1901	"Fairly satisfactory"	Mr. S. Barker	Jurist.
1902	"Fairly Good"	Mr. Gilmartin	Jurist.
1903	"Good"	Mr. Clapham	District
1904	"Good"	Mr. Chambers	District
1905	"Good"	Mr. O'Connell	District
1906	"Good"	Mr. O'Connell	District
1907	"Good"	Mr. Fenton	District
1908	"Fair, Slightly"	Mr. Dewar	Senior
1909	"Fair"	Mr. Cole	Senior
1910	"Fair"	Mr. Macdonald	Senior

I may first mention that on the strength of the first three of these reports, I was awarded a triennial increment of £7 per annum from 1st April, 1903, and that a second increment of £7 per annum was granted to me from 1st April, 1906. No special application was made for either of these increments of salary; they were awarded in the ordinary way in strict accordance with the rules of the Board. My service, therefore, during these six years, must have given satisfaction to the Commissioners; the same remark applies to the two following years, 1907 and 1908.

In connection with the remaining marks, those at 1909, 1910 and 1911, it may be mentioned that for the last four or five years there has been a remarkable simultaneous decline in the marks awarded to a large proportion of the Belfast schools; one-half, if not more of the schools in the city and district have had their reports lowered, and presumably, a large number of teachers have had their personal marks reduced in consequence. It is not surprising, therefore, that my mark was lowered by Mr. Dewar in 1909.

Mr. Naish also mentions that my mark as principal and also that of the school for the years 1910 and 1911 is "Fair." In reply to this objection, I may point out that in neither of these years was the inspection held by the inspector in charge of the section (District 2A) in which the school is situated. It is worthy of note that during the whole period (2 years 4 months), Mr. Heenan was in charge of this section, he never once held an inspection in this school.

The annual inspection in 1910 (my first as principal) was held by a young and comparatively inexperienced junior inspector, Mr. Cole. Now, in all fairness to me, an inspector of this type should not have been sent to conduct my first inspection after my appointment as principal teacher; the moment I saw Mr. Cole enter the school, I realised that my report would not be raised above the mark awarded in 1909 by the senior inspector, Mr. Dewar. Inspectors of Mr. Cole's standing don't often raise reports, especially when, as in this case, the previous report was given by a senior inspector. At the Teachers' Congress in 1903, a lady delegate stated that when a certain teacher mentioned to one of these recently appointed junior inspectors who was inspecting her school, that she considered her report should be raised, the inspector, Mr. Fenton, replied with commendable candour: "If I were to raise your report, the senior would be 'down' on me." Now, Mr. Cole was in exactly the same position in my school. In his report, he stated that the school had improved, but not sufficiently to merit a higher mark; this, I submit is a perfectly absurd contention, suggesting as it does that the Commissioners have not provided a sufficient number of merit marks for inspectors to choose from. Yet this is one of the reports which Mr. Naish wishes to quote against me.

But this is not all. Four months previously the senior inspector, Mr. Dewar, had visited the school; he visit lasted about forty minutes, and when leaving he repeatedly expressed himself as well satisfied with the condition of the school, mentioned also that when he visited a school he could tell very soon by the general tone whether work was efficiently carried on, and finally remarked: "When the inspector comes, he'll give you a 'Good' report."

When I received Mr. Cole's report marked "Fair," I at once wrote Mr. Dewar, reminding him of his observations mentioned above, and quoting specially his words about the "Good" report. In his reply he did not deny having spoken these words, but simply suggested that I should get my manager to communicate with the Board on the subject. My

manager, accordingly, at my request, challenged the report, and I understood, forwarded to the Secretaries a copy of my correspondence with Mr. Dewar. After the lapse of some months, Mr. Dewar came and held an inspection. In his report he actually stated that he was able to judge (in December) what the state of the school was in May previous, when Mr. Cole inspected, notwithstanding the fact that the personnel of the pupils had largely changed owing to the annual promotions, removals and admissions at the beginning of August. The result, of course, was a foregone conclusion; he simply "certified" that Mr. Cole's report was correct. How could he do so after the lapse of more than six months? It's worthy of note, however, that he stated, "The School is progressive and shows an upward trend," and that he did not even then attempt to deny having said to me that I would get a "Good" report.

The following year, 1911, I naturally expected Mr. Homan would conduct the inspection, but I was again disappointed. The school was inspected by Mr. MacMillan (Inspector of Circuit No.) who has the worst reputation of any inspector in the Board's service. His report was even more unreasonable than Mr. Cole's, for he stated: "The school is still improving, but not yet deserving of 'Good.'" How many undefined grades of efficiency do the Commissioners recognise between "Fair" and "Good?"

It is surely unnecessary for me to labour the point further, but I think I may venture the opinion that whoever sent Messrs. Cole and MacMillan to supersede the local inspection in the inspection of my school knew perfectly well that my report wouldn't be aided by either. So far as I am aware no school in this neighbourhood has been similarly dealt with.

In June, 1911, in consequence of certain complaints by teachers in Belfast and elsewhere, regarding the lowering of reports, the Commissioners issued instructions to inspectors, the tendency of which will be to stereotype the existing marks at least in schools inspected by district and junior inspectors. According to the terms of the official circular, no merit mark is to be changed by any inspector below the rank of senior, without the consent of the latter officer. How many reports have been raised on the initiative of these subordinate officials since the issue of this circular twelve months ago? The merit marks in these reports now dependent largely on the rank of the inspector and the marks of the previous year may still exercise a potent influence in connection with the award of increments or promotion, but it surely can't be claimed for them that they reflect in any degree the state of efficiency of the schools. The results system had its failings, and its system of inspection was by no means an ideal one, yet under that system the teacher's work for a given year was estimated entirely by the answering of his pupils at the end of the annual period, and the report set forth the conditions of the school at the time irrespective of the rank of the inspector or the answering of the previous year.

Mr. Nash traverses my statement that I would probably have obtained promotion to P' class, and thus have received £21 additional per annum, had the old system continued. He alleges my reports would not have qualified me for admission to the examination; in reply to this contention, I might state that under that system the teacher's claim to

sit at an examination for promotion under the "highly efficient service" regulation, was largely decided by the recommendation of the inspector in charge of the district, who was influenced considerably by the answering of the teacher's pupils at the annual results examination. Now, from the beginning of my career in 1892, on up till four or five years ago, my school work was tested by inspectors who, while exacting the full requirements of the programme, were absolutely just and impartial in their awards. Not one of those inspectors would have willingly done me, or any teacher, an injustice; the fact that my promotions and increments came automatically from 1893 till 1906 testifies to this. Therefore, if the old system of promotion had continued, and any of these inspectors had refused to recommend me for admission to examination for P, however much I might have been disappointed, I would have loyally acquiesced in his decision for I would have recognised it as conscientiously given.

With regard to Mr. Nash's gentle reminder of possible failure at the examination, I may say that this is the only portion of the report the consideration of which I approach with diffidence. The last programme for P was divided, I believe, into three parts; University graduates were exempted from examination in one of these parts, and as a B.A. (in Honors), I could have claimed this privilege. The remaining parts of the examination were of an entirely professional character, somewhat on the lines of the course prescribed by certain universities for diploma in teaching; as I have successfully negotiated this examination in Trinity College, Dublin, I believe I would at least have the courage to face the Board's test for P had I ever been called on to do so.

Mr. Nash deplores the difficulty of the "standard numbers"; there were no standard numbers under the old system. He also mentions the efforts of the Commissioners to secure bonuses for principals of large schools—subject to efficiency. Under the rosette system, principals of large schools were amply provided for, the scale of payments working automatically in their favour. Were that system in operation now, I would have absolutely no grievance. The fact that the Commissioners consider it necessary to apply to the Treasury for bonuses for principals of large schools is an admission that such teachers are not properly remunerated under the new system. Further, if "efficiency" is to be estimated, as it has been, during recent years in Belfast, very few, I apprehend, will ever qualify for the bonuses.

The final paragraph of the Accountant's report is somewhat obscure. Mr. Nash there seems to state that if I can prove, either that the Pension Department had provided me with larger pension rights, or that the Commissioners have depressed me in salary my point re comparison of Board's action with that of the Pension Office would be made. I never claimed that my pension rights had been increased. I stated simply that the Pension Authorities had adhered strictly to their rules, and allowed me to pay the premiums for 1st class or grade on my appointment as principal teacher. The Board's rules for 1897 (when I was promoted to first class) provided that when appointed to a principalship, I would be paid the salary and emoluments of a first class teacher, and Mr. Nash, in his report expressly states that this has not been done.

APPENDIX LII.

Statement handed in on behalf of the Irish National Teachers' Organisation

By Miss CATHERINE M. MAHON, President.

PART I.

INTRODUCTORY.

Foundation.

The Irish National Teachers' Organisation was established in 1898. In 1907 Lady Representatives were admitted for the first time to the Central Executive Committee. Its membership at that time was 6,000. It is now almost 10,000, and is still increasing.

Progress.

In 1912 it elected its first Lady President. It has received favourable official, Ecclesiastical and Royal recognition more particularly since 1907. At the Dublin Congress the then newly appointed Chief Secretary attended, and in a most sympathetic address, promised the teachers what was afterwards known as the Burrell Grant. On the same occasion he made a promise, which has not yet fully materialised, though he has obtained some relaxations, viz., Civil rights for teachers.

Recognition.

At the Killarney Congress the Bishop presided, and the Viceroy travelled down specially and gave an address on "Health of School Children," and since then Her Excellency has invariably attended our Congresses.

Our Congresses have been attended by representative public men from every other Educational department, and even by National Commissioners in their private capacity, but never by the official head of the Department, the Resident Commissioner.

Objects.

The expressed objects of the Teachers' Organisation are:—

- (a) The promotion of Education in Ireland.
- (b) The social and intellectual elevation of the teachers.
- (c) The cultivation of a fraternal spirit and professional intercourse with kindred organisations in other countries.

Description.

It is non-sectarian and non-political, and embraces teachers of all creeds and political opinions. Its unity is at present at high-water mark. It has (a) local Associations in every important town to the number of 220 at present; (b) County Associations, embracing all the local Associations of each County; eight Districts, into which all the Counties are numerically grouped for the purpose of electing the Central Executive Committee. The Central Executive Committee (known as the C.E.C.) consists of eight District Representatives, two Lady Representatives, two Assistants' Representatives, and four higher officers, viz., President, Vice-President, Central Secretary and Treasurer, numbering in all sixteen. The Central Committee, at each meeting where necessary, appoints certain members as sub-committees to inquire into a report upon matters that are sent up from the local Associations, or that come from sent up from the local Associations, or that come from Chancellor, Chief Secretary, etc., from kindred bodies such as the Gaelic League, from the Commissioners, and also on various current matters which affect education and the teachers.

Methods.

The sub-committees make inquiries, collaborate and furnish a report containing all information available. This is considered by the whole committee, criticised, amended, and published or acted on; probably a deputation appointed to forward the views contained therein.

The C.E.C. deputations are freely received and consulted by the Viceroy, Viceroine, Chief Secretary, Under-Secretary, Chancellor of the Exchequer, Heads of Political Parties; is invited to Conferences with representatives of Public Bodies on Irish, Scholarship, and kindred questions.

The only body hostile to the Organisation is the National Board.

This Board was altogether inaccessible to the teachers till 2nd October, 1911, and even since it can only be approached through an exorbitant quantity of red-tape. The Commissioners never co-operated with the teachers, or identified themselves with the teachers even in demands with which they agreed. Any concessions won for education were those which the teachers agitated for, those denied were those which the teachers did not support.

Hostility of Administration (a).

The Board had no influence in the country or in Parliament, except in so far as its requests coincided with the demands put forward by the Teachers' Organisation.

Dr. Stokely never attended Teachers' Congresses.

The Resident Commissioner never attended a Teachers' Congress, though Dr. Stokely had been invited almost every year from the Derry Congress in 1900 to the Killarney Congress in 1912, and though he goes to every other sort of an educational function, e.g., British Association, Imperial Federal Conference, University Opening, Technical Congress, Manual Conference, in fact, anywhere and everywhere to any other department, but a congress of the workers of his own department he would not touch or identify himself with.

Achievements.

The Organisation has gained among many other things:—(1) Residences; (2) Pensions; (3) Burrell Grant, and a distribution satisfactory to the Organisation; (4) Scholarships; (5) Heating and Cleaning Grant (per Her Excellency); (6) Installation of Civil Rights; (7) Various improvements in Teachers' Salaries from time to time; (8) Being of ten for Assistants; (9) Lowering of Average for Assistants to 50, etc., etc. In fact, all the financial improvements in the teachers' position have been won by the Organisation, without any help from the Board.

Hostility of Administration (b).

Its hostility, shown in many ways, e.g., by docking the salaries of deputations who interview British Ministers and Irish Parliamentary Representatives, in the effort to obtain the financial aid which the Commissioners in recent years profess themselves anxious for, but unable to extract from the Government.

PART II.

Taking up the Terms of Reference, I shall try as far as possible to maintain a chronological sequence in my statement. I shall, therefore, first deal with these

two points, which I shall take in succession, viz., "THE DELIVERY OF THE COMMISSIONERS TO THE TEACHERS," and "WHETHER MEANS OF ACCESS TO THE BOARD ARE ALLOWED TO THE TEACHERS" since the introduction of the new system, with its triunity of Progression, Inspection, and Guidance. I shall limit quotations mainly to resolutions and statements taken from the minutes of the Central Committee. The Executive pronouncements are the outcome of complaints and appeals received by the central body from the teachers throughout the country, and are the collective opinions of the members of the Organisation, as well as a reliable indication of the extent and nature and causes of existing disorders.

Press extracts and pronouncements of individuals, other than official, are, for the sake of brevity, rarely introduced.

Owing to some evidence already given, I desire to make it perfectly clear that the teachers never had any unpleasantness or discord with Sir Patrick Keenan or the Hon. T. C. Redington. Even though the results system was introduced in Sir Patrick's time, and that the teachers from the first never approved of that system, and even though the Board as a whole was hostile to the teachers, as it has severally been from the time it tried to abolish the Teachers' Guild Committee by Circular 1835, down to Major Gerald Dwyer's attack in the *Tribune* newspaper last June, 1918, yet the personal relations of the teachers with Sir Patrick were always cordial, friendly, and, I might almost say, brotherly. In substantiation of this I submit the resolution of the C.E.C. on Sir Patrick's death, and the very pathetic letter of his son in reply, a letter which shows that Sir Patrick's friendship for the teachers was so cultured or political pretence, but was expressed privately in the bosom of his family:—

1st December, 1894. Resolution of C.E.C.—"That as teachers we have special reason to deplore the death of a gentleman who was ever sympathetic with the just claims of our body, who was always ready to receive most courteously the representatives of teachers, and discuss with them various matters affecting their interests."

The following is an extract from the reply received from Norbert Keenan on 18th December, 1894:—

"We value your sympathy very highly, indeed, as a proof that those who were most affected by the loss of his official life bear such kindly thoughts of regret for his loss. I assure you that when last year our dear mother was so suddenly taken from us, of all the sympathy offered my father on that sad occasion, there was none that he valued so highly, or which had greater influence in assuaging the grief, if it could be assuaged, of so severe an affliction, than that so freely and generously extended to him by the National Teachers of Ireland. Often he spoke to me of their fidelity and gratitude as something that in the midst of his sorrow he should feel grateful and thankful to God for allowing him to enjoy."

Right Hon. T. C. Redington

The Rt. Hon. T. C. Redington succeeded in 1893, and through all the records of the Organisation there is not one allusion personally antagonistic to Mr. Redington. On the contrary, at the Galway Congress in 1897 the Central Committee, by special invitation, paid a visit to Mr. Redington at his Galway residence. At his death the Central Committee, on the 15th February, 1899, passed the following resolution:—

"That we, the representatives of the National Teachers of Ireland, are desirous of placing on record our deep regret at the early and unexpected death of the Rt. Hon. T. C. Redington, Resident Commissioner of National Education, from whom we have at all times experienced the utmost courtesy, and who invariably showed a ready willingness to listen to our representations."

And on the same day they petition in another resolution:—

"That as the successful working of the National Education Scheme, and also the nature of the education itself, depend very largely upon the Resident Commissioner, we respectfully but strongly urge upon the whole body of the Commissioners the

desirability of recommending a person for the vacancy who is thoroughly conversant with the Primary School System, who is in sympathy and touch with the teachers, and who would be willing at all times to take into serious consideration the representations placed before him by the representatives of the teaching body."

Dr. Starke's Administration—13 Years' Civil War.

Instead of this the vacancy was filled by a man whose administration, unfortunately for himself, for the Board, for the teachers, and for education, has been one long period of civil war between the teachers and himself, broken only by occasional truces, during which hostilities were merely suspended, only to break out anew with increased violence on every new provocation. In this warfare the teachers were never the aggressors. They were on the defensive on every occasion, repelling an insult or resisting some violation of their vested rights. In fact, during the 13 years' of Dr. Starke's administration the teachers pursued their sedulous profession with the sceptre of duty in one hand, and the sword of defence in the other. On every occasion the teachers were looked by the country, and Dr. Starke by his Board. The Board, standing on its Charter, defied the whole Irish people, clergy, laity, and teachers combined, and it was a humiliating position to see Irish teachers forced to fly across the Channel, or rush to Dublin Castle to throw themselves on the mercy of English Ministers, to claim as subjects of an English King protection from injustice, and redress of wrongs inflicted by a Board of 30 Irishmen at home. This they have had to do time and again, for the last thirteen years.

Two main causes.

This unhappy state of affairs was largely due to the unlimited and unrestricted power placed in the hands of the present Resident Commissioner, partly by the discontinuance of the Office Committee in 1899, thereby abolishing the check which the two Chiefs and three Secretaries had hitherto exercised over previous Resident Commissioners' judgments; but mainly by the mandate of 1902, by which the Board delegated its rights, privileges, responsibilities, and duties to the Resident Commissioner. A man of Warren Hastings-like disposition, "who, in sympathy with the rights of others and in compassion for the sufferings of others was deficient."

Dr. Starke's initial Jefe—Sweeping away Vested Rights.

Dr. Starke began his administration by sweeping away the vested rights of almost every class of worker he found in the National Education Department, from the vested rights of the highest chief of inspectors, whom he found before him in the office, with a lifetime of good service, to the vested right of the most junior student in the Training College at the time, and he has continued this policy of destruction of vested rights ever since in the exercise of his rule-making powers.

Contact with Civil Service—Public Bodies.

In no other public department has this ever been done. In the Civil Service there is option of something under the old rules or inducement to come under the new. With public bodies there is always ample and liberal compensation. Yet, Dr. Starke blames the disagreements of his colleagues, the disloyalty of the chiefs, the unprogressiveness of the inspectors, the opposition of the teachers, the conservatism of the managers, the desertion of the Government, for the failure and discontent which characterised his administrative cycle of 13 years. He ridiculed the managers in 1902 and 1907, he ridiculed and antagonised the teachers on the same and many other occasions, he drove the teachers to desperation by alarming every door leading to the Board in their faces at the most extreme crisis in their positions, refused to hear them, and shut out all avenues of redress by constituting himself the Caesar of the Board, like unto Warren Hastings among the Begums.

Now, like Hastings, all those whom Macaulay calls "sympathisers," and whom Dr. Starke calls "subordinators," who had to ponder to him and to cringe to him, all hasten to join his enemies in accusing him. There must be something wrong when a man finds

himself universally deserted, opposed, and impeached. The *Irish News*, on 8th November, 1912, says:—"He has weakened a system that was radically wrong from the day of its establishment. He has made himself impotent, and the teachers should resist on his transference to some other sphere of activity."

The other Commissioners as a Board cannot be excused or their culpability overlooked in bringing about the present situation.

Board's Responsibility.

When a vacancy occurs on the Board a man moves every power "under Heaven" to get pulled on, and once he adds the letters C.N.E.I. to his name, he seems to cast all the responsibility of his honorary and honorable position over on the shoulders of the paid Commissioner, forgetting that his position has its duties as well as its honors. In fact, the only duty the unpaid Commissioners seem to perform is to let everything the Resident Commissioner puts before them. They invariably support the official, and seem to take no account of the wester vessel, the teacher, whom by virtue of their office they are bound to shield and protect from the harsh, arbitrary, or unjust treatment of all, or any, of the entire staff of officials under their control.

Historic Causes.

The only explanation of this is that the first Commissioners were drawn from the landlord class, at a time when the people were absolutely at the mercy of the landlords, and were ground into slavery, and trampled on and evicted ruthlessly, to preserve power and maintain discipline among the down-trodden people.

That is all past now, owing to the result of the long-suffering victims, a revolt which led to peasant propriety and freedom. The old spirit has been handed down on the Board, and each new member assimilated to the old spirit.

Hope for Future.

God grant that the teachers' revolt may sweep away this spirit from the Board, as the farmers' revolt swept it from the land, and lead to a cleaner, purer, fairer, more sympathetic, more judicial, and more impartial administration of Irish Primary Education. If it does, this Commission will not have lived in vain.

YEAR 1860.

Circular, Penalties for Inefficiency and Falsification, 1860.

In May, 1860, the circular on penalties for inefficiency was issued; in June the circular as falsification of accounts was not only issued to managers and teachers, but published in the newspapers. This was apparently an innovation of the new regime, and the teachers began to take alarm, for on the 4th November, 1860, the C.E.C. issued the following protest:—"The tendency of the recent circulars of the Commissioners in reference to fines and other penalties appears to be in direct opposition to the concluding words of Rule 172, where, after describing the stamp of man suitable for National teacher, the Commissioners say—these are the persons the Commissioners are anxious to find, to encourage, and to reward. The whole machinery of the Education Office would now appear to be set in motion to fine, discourage, and crush out of the service men and women who have brought the National system of education from a thing barely tolerable to a popular, useful, and successful institution, who have in fact brought it from obscurity and given it a career."

Teachers' Protest.

"The circular as to fines for falsification is one, though we deplore the fact of its issue, on which we recommend no action to be taken as it is only legalizing a practice which has always existed. The publication in the newspaper, however, of such a circular is not calculated to raise the teacher in public esteem, and consequently must act injuriously on the system of National education itself. The matter is, however, different with the notice as to penalties for inefficiency. The Organization has never attempted

to shield an inefficient teacher, but the power thrown into the hands of an unsympathetic or inefficient inspector, or one prone to fault-finding, by the recent circular, is such as can be utilized to drive out, not improve, but highly efficient and capable teachers, out of the service. In fact such a power in the hands of an unsympathetic inspector might be made an instrument of the poorest tyranny." And then they wind up by demanding—"That the depositions of a teacher shall not be sanctioned except on the report of one of the head inspectors or chiefs of inspection, after a re-examination of the school with the manager present."

Appeal demanded then and now.

After an interval of a dozen years, since that statement was written, the teachers are still in the unhappy position of asking the same demand to-day in an appeal to the higher powers, and a fair and impartial trial before sentence, either of death in the way of dismissal, or of punishment by deprivation of increment and promotion, is pronounced upon them. As it has elapsed two years afterwards, the death of the inefficiency circular proved even a greater calamity than its birth.

YEAR 1900.

Resolutions by Teachers' Executive welcoming New System as outlined by Dr. Starke.

Notwithstanding the new atmosphere of the Board, the teachers continued to make overtures of friendship to Dr. Starke. That they were willing and anxious to co-operate with him, and to give him every assistance, if he had only given them a chance, or paid any respect to their vested rights, the following quotations show:—On the 3rd March, 1900, the C.E.C. passed resolutions declaring:—"That we have read with extreme satisfaction the able speech of Dr. Starke outlining the principles of the proposed new Educational Scheme, and that we have no doubt whatever, but that a comprehensive reform, based on the principles set forth by the Resident Commissioner, will be warmly welcomed by the Irish National teachers. We trust that in the proposals under the scheme care will be taken to secure teachers against the dangers that would follow were their emoluments to be placed completely at the mercy, and the caprices, and the whimsicalities of individual inspectors. We earnestly hope that the new system shall be one suitable to the particular requirements of our country, and we also hold that the views of experienced and representative teachers should be duly taken and considered before the new system is finally adopted, as it cannot be denied that they are peculiarly qualified to give valuable counsel and assistance in the formation of any system of elementary education." Again, at the Congress in Derry in 1900 a resolution was passed expressing satisfaction with Dr. Starke's Glanerin speech, and "promising cordial support to the new scheme based on such admirable principles as those outlined."

Dr. Starke got most favorable start.

These resolutions and numerous others in the same strain at that time, regarding their endorsement of the view of Archbishop Walsh that the results system was a "deadly morbus," and of Dr. Starke that it was "an elaborate mosaic of expenses and shillings," and expressing their goodness that "their oft-repeated opinions on the subject were now admitted by the most eminent authorities to be absolutely correct," etc., give a most emphatic contradiction to those who seek to represent the teachers as unprogressive or unprepared to welcome the new system in 1860, or inclined to be in any way prejudiced against it, or against its authors. The *Irish School Weekly* and various sections of the *Irish Press* were laudatory of the designs outlined by Dr. Starke in Glanerin, so that instead of being in any way handicapped he got a most favorable start; and for the fact that the scheme so auspiciously born at Glanerin is now ready for interment there, he has no one to blame but himself.

Teachers' Deputation refused.

On the 5th May, 1900, the long-drawn-out battle began. On that day the Teachers' Executive, on the motion of Mr. Philip Ward, now Commissioner, appointed a deputation "to wait on the Resident Com-

missioner with references to the proposed changes in the system." This was met by a refusal, and on the 9th June the deputation was commissioned to proceed to London to interview the Chief Secretary, Mr. Gerald Balfour. On the 14th July extracts from the proposed new rules appeared in the newspapers. This was the first intimation of them the teachers had, as they were hatched with the greatest secrecy in the Education Office. When the teachers saw, among other things, that grading of schools was to take the place of classification of teachers, that the rules were to be retrospective, and that at one fell swoosh the classification of almost half the teachers of Ireland, won by study and industry, was to be swept away, their consternation may be imagined.

First intimation of New Rules in Press.

A fest at first class teacher who had passed brilliant examinations, who had turned out boys for Church and State in his little school in the valley of Kerry or the wilds of Donegal, suddenly withdrew on the 14th July, 1900, to learn through the public newspapers that henceforth he was to be a third grade teacher, the fruits of his life's industry gone, vanished like a will-o'-the-wisp. The fact that his salary was not to be actually cut down was no solace for the wound inflicted on his dignity and self-respect at the loss of his professional prestige and honour.

Deputation to Mr. Balfour.

The Central Executive deputation rushed to London and appeared to Mr. Balfour. He willingly gave them the hearing Dr. Sturges refused them on the 18th July, 1900; but unfortunately Chief Secretaries then, as now, could do nothing but forward their case to the Board, there to be contemptuously spurned, ignored or disregarded.

Points put before Mr. Balfour.

Mr. Redmond and Mr. Pat O'Brien were present and the deputations pointed out to Mr. Balfour that they, though the most vitally concerned parties, had no knowledge of the new rules only what they could infer from the extracts in the Press, but from what those forecasts, serious injury would be done to the teachers:—

"(a) that the abolition of teachers' classification, won by scholarship and efficiency, and the substitution of school grading based on previous income from the State, would deprive highly-qualified teachers in small schools, and all first and second class masters, of the rank which they had obtained by meritorious service and success at examinations, that this was contrary to the Board's practice for 60 years, and that it was most unjust to deprive a teacher of his class except by operation of the rules in force when he obtained it; (b) that the high averages necessary for the proposed grades would practically shut out the great majority from promotion; (c) that injustice would be done in many cases by basing future income on previous three years' average; (d) that the proposed degradation of a teacher when the average fell below a certain limit was a new injustice, that hitherto, though he might be paid at a lower rate, he retained his classification; (e) that the abolition of the annual examination of teachers seeking promotion, and making the examination at the close of teaching the ultimate test of attainments was calculated to lower the scholarship of the profession unless the time of training and the curriculum for entrance examination were extended."

Mr. Balfour's inability to prevent grievances.

But Mr. Balfour was powerless to prevent, through his strategy, (a) abolition of classification; (b) violation of vested rights of existing teachers; (c) new rules of averages and their effect on promotion; (d) hardship arising from the averaging of the three years' salaries; (e) limiting the income of assistants on promotion to principality to former income as assistants; (f) depression of teachers for falling averages; (g) abolition of examination for teachers.

Mr. Balfour's reply.

"Mr. Balfour," the deputation report informs us, "declared he had no power to interfere with the rules of the Commissioners, and said the deputation should

have waited on them. He seemed particularly impressed with the injustice of degrading any teacher from present rank, and also with the moderation of the claim that the teacher's certificate should be indefeasible, and with the necessity for requiring that the present standard of scholarship should by some means be maintained."

Mr. Balfour's suggestion to interview Board.

After going into detail regarding the various points, the deputations told us that "Mr. Balfour's attitude towards us may truly be described as courteous and sympathetic. He seemed surprised to learn that we had been refused an interview at the Education Office. Mr. O'Brien very pointedly observed it was well a higher Court was open to us." But unfortunately the anomaly of the situation was the higher Court could well ought against a Board that stood on an anomalous Charter.

Resolution applying to Board in reception of Deputation.

Acting on Mr. Balfour's advice, the Central Executive on their return from London made application to the Board to receive them in the following very respectful and conciliatory resolution on the 20th July, 1900: "That as managers and teachers are eminently qualified from their intimate and practical acquaintance with the work of elementary education in Ireland to offer suggestions which would very materially assist those who are devising the future scheme, and as the success of the scheme must to a large extent depend, not only on its freedom from impracticable features, but also upon the earnest co-operation of the managers and teachers of National schools, we cannot but regard it as in the highest degree regrettable that the Commissioners have not consulted those who are most interested in education, and have not even given them an opportunity of placing their views before them in reference to any changes which may be contemplated, and we therefore most urgently and respectfully request the Commissioners to receive a deputation from this Committee in order that the views of the teachers may be fully ascertained before it is too late."

Board's refusal.

This request to the Board was refused in the usual office phraseology, repeated many times since, down as late as 1910: "I am directed to inform you that it is not the practice of the Board to receive deputations."

Protest against Board's refusal to receive Deputation.

We learn this from the Executive resolution of the 20th September, 1910, "That we regard with the utmost dissatisfaction and regret the reply of the Commissioners of National Education to our request to place before them by deputation the views of 12,000 teachers in reference to the momentous changes which have been made in the rules and regulations of the Board. That we feel justified in stating that, as a matter of courtesy and right, the Commissioners of National Education, who are deputed by the State to regulate and control the service in which we are employed, should have received our deputation, as did the Right Hon. Mr. Balfour, Chief Secretary for Ireland, who remarked to our deputation that the teachers might, with benefit to themselves, interview the Commissioners with reference to the proposed changes. We hope, therefore, the reply of the Commissioners is not final."

Executive opinion of New Programme.

And with regard to the New Programme we find the Executive, on the motion of Mr. Philip Ward, expressing the following strong opinion on the same date: "That the absence of practical knowledge in the actual working of a school is so observable throughout the entire programme that we feel justified in renewing our opinion that a scheme of this character, so important and far-reaching in its results, should not be finally arranged and issued without consultation with experienced teachers, who are in the best position to judge of its practicability."

Third Appeal for an interview through Dr. Sturkie.

And then like the importunate widow they make another appeal to Dr. Sturkie to receive a deputation on behalf of the teachers. But Mr. Philip Ward and his teacher colleagues met with stout courtesy twelve years ago, and the door of the Education Office was for the third time banged in their faces.

Refusal and Executive Protest.

Then giving up the attempt as hopeless the C.E.C. on the 1st December, 1900, on the motion of Mr. Ward, again issued the following protest against their treatment: "That we have learned with regret and disappointment the objection for the second time of the Resident Commissioner to receive a deputation from this Committee representing those who will have to put the new programme into operation, in the first instance before the programme was issued that it would be inconvenient to receive a deputation at that stage, and now we are informed that it would be useless to discuss details till the system is at least a year in operation. That the result of the first refusal was the issuing of a programme unfair and impracticable in many respects, and the result of the present refusal will be to inflict an injustice on the pupils, teachers, and the country for at least a year, for we can hardly believe that the unreasonably overworked state of the programme generally, and the abnormal extent of its requirements in some particulars, would be permitted to remain if the teachers' representatives got the opportunity of discussing the details, and putting their views before those in authority."

And again, on the 29th December, 1900, they declare: "We must emphatically say that we have little faith in a universally tentative and provisional programme. We consider it would be much better to perfect it so far as the experience of managers, teachers, and inspectors could make it perfect. For that purpose we made several respectful applications to the Board and the Resident Commissioner for interviews, but we were refused." On the same date the Executive resolved to cross the Channel again and make another appeal for consideration through the new Chief Secretary, Mr. Wyndham. Thus ended the year 1900, and I submit that it was unjust, unfair, and untenable to thus deny the teachers' representatives all means of access to the Board, at a transition period when their professional existence and prospects were at stake.

Resolutions of 1900 indicating Teachers' Grievances under New System.

During all this year 1900 the Teachers' Executive, at meeting after meeting, sent forward resolutions and statements (a) "protesting against lowering of rank and status under the new system as not less objectionable than change of 'income'"; (b) declaring that "promotion should depend on service and efficiency, and should be open to all teachers whose schools are maintained in a satisfactory state of efficiency, irrespective of number in any grade or section"; (c) asserting that the proposed introduction of the barrier known as standard numbers "was calculated to destroy efficiency, and to damp laudable ambition"; (d) asking for a "reversion to the old system of averages under which a school of 30 could have a second class teacher, and a school of 25 a first of first"; (e) asking for "special consideration for transition teachers," etc.

Resolutions sent to Board—no recognition.

They hoped by means of these as a last resort to make their views known to the Board, but all evidently fell on "deaf ears and stony hearts." To the closure of the Board against the teachers at this time may be traced a great part of the troubles of succeeding years.

Year 1901.

Deputation to Mr. Wyndham.

On the 29th May, 1901, Mr. Wyndham received the teachers in London, but professed himself unable to influence the Board, or the Treasury.

Resignation of Dr. Walsh.

In June, 1901, Archbishop Walsh, who had promised the teachers that "no teacher would suffer a penny by the change," resigned from the Board.

On September 21st, 1901, the next outbreak of hostilities between Dr. Sturkie and the teachers occurred.

Libel on Teachers by Dr. Sturkie of the Royal University Commission.

At the Royal University Commission Bishop O'Dwyer stated that "the most astonishing thing was to take up our Catholic newspapers—papers that are avowedly Catholic, that profess to support Catholic principles—they write things that are shocking to a man who understands Catholic principles, that are simply revolutionary, that are simply socialist, and which, if they were carried to their logical conclusion, would turn society topsy-turvy"; and then the Bishop explained—"But these people do not know what they are writing. The articles are written by flippant intermediate clergies, who go there and write these articles"—and before he could proceed farther Dr. Sturkie interrupted him with the opinion—"National teachers mostly, I think." This attempt to brand the teachers as Socialists and revolutionaries, without a particle of proof, was particularly harmful at that time, inasmuch as the teachers were just then emerging from troubles with the clerical powers, over security of tenure, which had arisen with the promulgation of the Mayothon resolutions in June, 1900, but the effects of which had not yet died down.

Teachers' Executive refute Dr. Sturkie's Libel.

On the 23rd November, 1901, the Teachers' Executive indignantly declared—

"That we have seen with astonishment and indignation statements published in the Dublin newspapers, from the examination of the Most Rev. Dr. O'Dwyer before the Royal Commission on University Education, in which the grave charge of writing in the Catholic Press 'things that are shocking to anyone who understands Catholic principles, and that are simply revolutionary and socialist, and which, if carried to their logical conclusion, would turn society 'topsy-turvy,' have been attributed to the National teachers by the Resident Commissioner."

"That we repudiate these charges as false and groundless, and that such statements made before a public Commission by the Head of the National Education Department cannot fail to be injurious to the progress of Primary Education, and that they are highly calculated to estrange confidence in Dr. Sturkie's administration of the National Board, and in his capacity of properly directing the public education of the country, in the progress of which the teachers are vitally concerned." Thus ended 1901.

Demand for Sworn Inquiry before Dismissals.

During this year the dismissals began to increase, and the Executive passed a resolution demanding—

"That no teacher should be depressed or dismissed by the Board until a Sworn Inquiry has been held, as in the case with the officials under the Local Government Board."

To-day, after the lapse of 12 years, we are still making the same demand.

Year 1902.

Board's Minute, 1902.

On the 7th January, 1902, the Board's famous minute was passed, virtually giving over to the Resident Commissioner sole control of teachers and inspectors, and practically abolishing all check on his further career. In the letter of Mr. Bonaparte Wise, on the 1st November, 1912, he states that, according to the 1902 minute, "outside of general principles, and the classes of subject-matter to which they are applicable, Dr. Sturkie alone had authority to decide what cases should be submitted to the Board, and that he would not tolerate dictation in this from any subordinate official" (meaning by "subordinate" in this case a chief inspector of 40 years' service).

Teachers not aware of Minute.

No teacher in all Ireland knew of the existence of this minute till Mr. Wynne's letter appeared in 1912, and for 10 years teachers and managers lived in the belief that when they wrote the Secretaries their appeals went, as a matter of course, before the Board. It is open to doubt if three-fourths of the present Board knew of its existence, for of all the members on the Board in January, 1902, only five now remain.

Confidential Report.

A Confidential Report, asking managers to send in information about teachers, was issued about this time, for on the 28th June, 1902, the Executive, by resolution, "request the Commissioners of National Education to immediately withdraw from use the forms known as the Confidential Report, as every teacher in Ireland looks upon that form as a humiliation and personal insult."

Monsieur O'Riordan's Comment on Conference Report.

Alluding to this report, Monsieur O'Riordan says, in his reply to Dr. Sturkie:—"It is not a fact that question-sheets have been sent to the managers, asking for confidential information about the teachers. Men who have to discharge public duties in that way brand themselves as incapables, and what is worse, they show that neither managers nor teachers should trust them as far as they could throw them."

Dr. Sturkie's Attack on Organisation in Belfast.

After getting up complete control into his hands by the minute of 1902, Dr. Sturkie went to Belfast in September, 1902, and in an address which he delivered there before the British Association he held every representative class in the country up to ridicule in the eyes of all the foreigners assembled there from the uttermost ends of the earth. In his address, after disposing of Archbishop Whately and others of his predecessors, he next attacks the teachers' representatives. In one place he said:—"From their public utterances one would think the old programme was the emanation of Divine wisdom." He ridiculed the assertion of the teachers, "that promotion through all the grades will be so slow, that it will take 90 years to reach the maximum of the highest grade."

Dr. Sturkie's Promises re Promotion.

He stated:—"It is our intention to promote the majority of teachers solely on merit. If we find a teacher of exceptional excellence in third grade, it is within our power to promote him to second grade, or even to first, whether his service be long or short." That might mean anything or mean nothing. That it meant little is apparent from the fact that in 12 years the Commissioners promoted two assistants out of 8,000, though there were over 1,000 vacancies in second grade. If this be the rate of promotion by merit it is even slower than the 30 years' course of promotion by rule.

Attack by Dr. Sturkie on the Teachers.

In the Belfast address Dr. Sturkie said of the teachers' agitation:—"So far from accepting their privileges gratefully, the leading spirits among them assailed the Board in an organised chorus of scurrility, rarely equalled even in this country." This was untrue. The teachers used no scurrility. Dr. Sturkie's admissions in Belfast, 1911, disproves his accusation of misrepresentation in 1902, and proves that the teachers' agitation was then justified, and still more, that he knew at the time he was denouncing it that it was justified. And then alluding to the Central Committee, which he refused to co-operate with, he says that "the great body of the teachers were wiser than their representatives." And then, as a sort of sop to individual teachers, after his attacks on the Organisation, he says:—"I never lost confidence in the loyal spirit of the Irish teachers, and I am happy to say it has been justified by results."

The loyalty he seems to want is the fidelity of a dog to its master, which obeys unquestioned. The only loyalty the teachers will give is the reasoned and intelligent loyalty of a fellow-Christian, who obeys through conviction of the rectitude and justice of the command.

Teachers Protest against Dr. Sturkie's Attack.

On the 25th October the Teachers' Executive, on the motion of Mr. Philip Ward, again resolved:—

"That we desire to correct the erroneous impression which Dr. Sturkie's references to the representatives of the teachers are calculated to convey, when he stated in his paper, read before the British Association in Belfast, that the teachers did not take the advice tendered to them by their leaders, but set about carrying out the New Programme in an earnest and whole-hearted manner, and in reply we now beg to point out, that on every occasion when we felt it our bounden duty to criticise some of the provisions of the new system, we at the same time made a strong and unmistakable appeal to the teachers to do everything in our power to make it a success."

"That while this Committee do not by any means try to sustain in the public service either an inefficient or idle servant, we view with alarm and regret the statement of the Resident Commissioner, on a recent public occasion in Belfast, that it was nothing less than a direct incentive to (respectors to report unduly on such teachers as find themselves unable through age, training, or special circumstances connected with the facilities of their schools, to carry out the New Programme in its entirety; that such a course of action would be utterly unfair to the large, useful, and respectable section of the Irish teachers who have hitherto given satisfactory public service, and that we call upon the managers of the schools, and other influential men, to sustain the status and claims of those teachers until by age, or a reasonable modification of the Pension Rules, they have become entitled to the maximum pensions of their grades."

With his attack on the managers I am not now concerned to deal. Monsieur O'Riordan and Fr. Corry castigated him in press and pamphlet. I want to remark that at the time, the teachers backed the managers, and passed resolutions in support of them, and that was one of the things Dr. Sturkie never forgives them for, just as he never forgives Mr. Downing for his refusal to condemn them in his report. When the new system was fully launched, and the teachers sufficiently incensed at his Belfast address for their criticism, Dr. Sturkie condescended to open the door to the Central Committee, and admitted them to an interview on the Equivalent Grant, due to Ireland under the Education Act of 1902, and from thence he received them till 1905, when the door was shut again during the 127(h) agitation.

YEAR 1903.

Transition Teachers' Memorial, 1903—Chief Secretary's Reply.

The teachers who were in training in 1900 had entered the Training Colleges under the old rules, which promised them 2nd class rank at the end of their course on passing examination on a certain programme of studies, but they found when they emerged from training that they were to begin on third grade under the new rules. They made repeated appeals to the Board for consideration, but in vain. In February, 1905, ninety-five of them sent to the Chief Secretary appeals, counter-signed by their managers, asking for an inquiry into their treatment. The Chief Secretary, in reply, declined to order an inquiry, on the ground that the Commissioners had informed him that every case submitted to the Board had been "carefully considered." These teachers are still agitating for redress after the lapse of 12 years, plainly demonstrating the futility of any open effective sort of appeal that would dispose of grievances one way or the other. The Board say they are considered, but the method of consideration, or the promises on which conclusions unfavourable to the teacher are arrived at, are a sealed book to the teachers affected.

Central Executive Programme presented to Dr. Sturkie.

In October, 1903, the Central Executive drew up a programme and presented it to Dr. Sturkie for his consideration. I am told by those who went to the trouble of comparing, that of all the items in that

programme, one solitary suggestion was adopted in the next revision, viz., "Multiplication by one figure for second standard." In this year also the first triennial period ended, and the resolutions of the Executive show that complaints began to pour in with regard to the withholding of increments, and the awarding the partial increments where full increments were due, though there was nothing in the rules to justify or require such chicanery.

Year 1904.

Resolutions showing growing discontent with Inspection System.

On the 26th February, 1904, the Teachers' Executive passed the following resolution, which gives an indication of how things were drifting:—

"That the teachers have observed with much regret, notwithstanding the statement made by the Resident Commissioner at Glencree some years ago, that the relations in future between inspectors and teachers would be of a much more cordial nature than hitherto in their professional intercourse with the schools; that instead of kindlier and more sympathetic relations the breach is becoming wider and wider between them, and that an undue power rests with the inspection staff under the present regime to injure or promote the interests of the teachers, without any effective guarantee of the strict justice or impartiality which should prevail in the official recommendation to the office regarding the interests and promotion of teachers."

Year 1905.

Promulgation of 127 (b).

In the beginning of 1905 the new 127(b) and Amalgamation rules were published. They had been passed by the Board in May, 1904, on the recommendation of Mr. Dale, the English expert, and incorporated in the rules in December, 1904. Though all was arranged with the utmost secrecy rumours got about, and on the publication of the rules a storm of indignation broke forth which convulsed the country all round from the centre to the sea. The Cardinal, Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Ministers, M.P.s, laymen of all denominations, protested in union with the teachers. As the rule stood at its first publication it meant ruin to the men teachers' prospects, in many instances loss of all further increments and promotion, in some cases even depression in grade, in all cases where enforced loss of emolument. Mr. MacSwiney of Antrim, got his case tested through Parliament, and found that on the enforcement of Rule 127(b) his salary would at once be decreased by £74 per year.

Deputation to Dr. Sturkie.

On the 18th March, 1905, a deputation waited on Dr. Sturkie. He told them emphatically that the rule would neither be withdrawn or altered, and that it was useless for them to dash themselves against a stone wall, and advised them, in private conversation with the managers, to advocate Amalgamation.

Dr. Foley's Resolution on 127 (b).

In April, after the exposure in Parliament through Mr. MacSwiney's case, Bishop Foley, in order to allay the alarm of the teachers, proposed to the Board the following resolution:—

"That any school, upon which the effect of 127 (b) would be to reduce the salary of an existing teacher, shall be exempt from the operation of that rule during such teacher's term of office."

This would secure from loss all existing teachers while in their present schools. It was ascertained through Parliament that there voted for justice to the teachers only five members, three of whom are still on the Board, and against the teachers eleven members, five of whom have since departed. For Dr. Foley's resolution there voted:—

1. Most Rev. Dr. Foley, Bishop.
2. Rev. Dr. Evans, D.D.
3. Major Deane.
4. Mr. Molloy (gone).
5. Mr. Morell (gone).

Against Dr. Foley's resolution there voted:—

1. Dr. Sturkie, Resident Commissioner.
2. The Lord Chief Baron Pallen.
3. Rev. Dr. Taylor, D.D.
4. Sir Stanley Harrington.
5. Lord Rillington.
6. Mr. Gwynn.
7. Dr. Tait (gone).
8. Mr. Justice Gibson (gone).
9. Rev. Dr. Wilson (gone).
10. Rev. Dr. Archdall (gone).
11. Sir R. Blomfield (gone).

Agitation over 127 (b).

The teachers were distracted from their duties, and in a universal state of panic; those affected because of the degradation and loss staring them in the face, those not affected because they might wake up any day to find their rights invaded by some new rule sprung on them through the advertising columns of the newspaper. Indignation meetings were held all over the country, at which all the representative men of the nation, from Cardinal Logue downwards, denounced the Board and counselled resistance to its edicts. In June, 1905, the entire Hierarchy, assembled in Maynooth, passed a resolution, advising all the managers of the National Schools to unite in refusing to put in force the new amalgamating rules.

Attitude of Hierarchy and Managers over 127 (b).

At their Central Council meeting on the 7th June, 1905, the Catholic Clerical Managers, after vigorously condemning 127 (b) and Amalgamation, called for the removal of Dr. Sturkie and the reform of the Board in the following emphatic resolutions:—

"That we demand the immediate reform of the Irish Board of National Education, on the grounds that, as at present constituted, it is unrepresentative, irresponsible, retrogressive, and, to a large extent, antagonistic to the National and religious feelings of the majority of the Irish people."

"That we have observed with regret that since the advent to office of the present Resident Commissioner, the proceedings of the Board of National Education have been, for the most part, an unbroken record of mischievous changes and innovations. New revolutionary educational schemes have been from time to time hastily adopted, and as hastily cast aside; and rules have been framed, modified and abolished with bewildering frequency, until the entire system of Primary Education has been reduced to a state of deplorable confusion. Teachers have been brought under a new system of classification, involving in many cases professional degradation and pecuniary loss, while the natural rights of parents and the views of managers regarding the education of the children have been contemptuously ignored. We believe, therefore, that the first step towards the reform of the Educational Board ought to be the removal of the present Resident Commissioner from an office which he has not filled for the benefit of Irish Primary Education, and in which he has forfeited the confidence of the majority of Irish managers."

Reference in Board's Report to 127 (b).

The teachers asserted that Mr. Dale's recommendation of this rule originated in a chicanery policy of the Treasury to cut down educational expenditure. This was officially denied by the Board in their report in 1906. And in reply to the complaint that it would lower the incomes of principals of boys' schools, both as regards grade salary and emolument, the report admits very callously that "It is true that the strict application of the rule might be to lower the incomes of the principals of small boys' schools, by preventing their promotion in grade, and by reducing their emolument grant," but adds the remedy is obvious, viz., amalgamation, as if that were any redress for teachers who had no power to enforce amalgamation.

The violence of this storm gradually spent itself in time, but the wound has rankled up to the present day.

*Resident Commissioner's Refusal to receive
Deputation.*

In June, 1905, while the agitation was at its height, the Teachers' Executive asked the Resident Commissioner for an interview. This was refused in the following letter:—

"OFFICE OF NATIONAL EDUCATION,
"DUBLIN, 29th June, 1905.

"Sir,

"Referring to your letter of 29th instant, with the copy of a resolution which was passed at last meeting of the Central Executive Committee of the National Teachers' Organisation, I am directed by the Resident Commissioner to inform you that in view of the attitude of the Committee in connection with the objectionable proceedings at the dinner given by the National Teachers' Association at Sligo in Easter week, and having regard to the public condemnation by the Commissioners of National Education of the action of the leaders of the Association, as now being conveyed by circular to the Managers and National School Teachers, it is not possible for the Resident Commissioner to receive a deputation from the Central Executive Committee, as requested in your letter.

"I am, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"MR. A. FRIESEN.

"T. CHALCOT, Esq., LL.D.,

"8 Alexandra Terrace, Bray."

What happened at Sligo Banquet.

The explanation of this letter is, that at the public banquet given by the Congress in Sligo some of the guests objected to drinking the toast of "The King." Up to quite recently "God Save the King" was a Party cry in this country, regarded as equivalent to "Down with the Pope," and conscientious Catholics had a scruple about honouring it on that account.

It was not proved that any teachers had participated in the act, even though it would not be surprising if some of them did so, for at the Sligo Congress the teachers were in a state of great irritation over the recent promulgation of 127 (b), and were loud and bitter in their resentment to the Board. In that frame of mind the King might get brushed with a wave of the hurricane raging all that week, not, indeed, on account of his personality or his sovereignty, but as the head of such an institution as the National Board.

The Board, without any direct evidence expressly incriminating any of the teachers, published the following flaming circular in the newspapers, and Dr. Sturkie, in the superabundant excess of his loyalty to the Crown and Constitution, again banged the door in the teachers' faces. But the teachers believed that the real reason for denying them admittance was because of their violent agitation over 127 (b), the disloyalty of a few invited guests at the Sligo banquet being only a convenient excuse, occurring opportunely at the time, because there is reason to suppose that a Board that disowns the King's Deputies—the Viceroy and Chief Secretary—would disown the King himself far sooner than the teachers would.

Board's Circular re Sligo Banquet.

TEACHERS AND LOYAL TOASTS.

THE SLOGO BANQUET INCIDENT.

The following "Circular to Teachers of National Schools," prefixed by the instruction in black type, "This Circular must be preserved in the Current Daily Report Book of the School," has been issued to National School Teachers by the National Board:—

The attention of the Commissioners has been drawn to the disloyal conduct of a section of the persons who were present at the public dinner given by the Teachers' Association assembled at Sligo in Easter week.

While the Commissioners accept the disclaimer of Mr. J. J. Hazlett, they consider that he and the other leaders of the Teachers' Association should immediately after the event have formally repudiated the disloyal action of these persons, and have dissociated themselves from their improper conduct.

The Commissioners feel that the matter should not be suffered to pass unmentioned or without rebuke, lest it should be considered that such conduct will be tolerated, and will not meet with the censure and punishment it deserves.

We are, therefore, instructed to notify that any teacher who may be proved to have taken any part in the disloyal demonstrations will receive the severest penalty which the Regulations permit.

Teachers, like other citizens, are free to have their own political views, but they are required to abstain from controversy and to be imbued with a spirit of obedience to the law and loyalty to the Sovereign.

The Commissioners take this opportunity of calling special attention to the following Rules from their Code of Regulations:—

Rule 89 (a).—The attendance of teachers at public meetings or meetings held for political purposes, or the taking part in elections for members of Parliament, or for Poor Law Guardians, etc., except by voting, is incompatible with the performance of their duties, and is a violation of rule, rendering them liable to withdrawal of salary.

Rule 94 III.—The following practical rules must be strictly observed by the teachers of National Schools:—To avoid feuds, malice, and meetings—but, above all, political meetings of every kind; to abstain from controversy; to be imbued with a spirit of obedience to the law and loyalty to the Sovereign; and to do nothing in or out of the school which might have a tendency to combine it to any disunion of children.

Rule 94 VIII.—To pay the strictest attention to the morals and general conduct of their pupils, and to omit no opportunity of inculcating the principles of truth, honesty, and politeness, the duties of respect to superiors, and obedience to all persons placed in authority over them.

The Commissioners regret to observe a growing spirit of insubordination on the part of many teachers, and a disregard of the above rules. Recently they have had to withdraw salary from a teacher for taking part in political meetings, and they have determined to punish severely in future any teacher who infringes these regulations, or who is instrumental in fomenting strife and disorder in his neighbourhood. Meetings, which, judged by their professed object, seem harmless, frequently assume a political, and even a disloyal, character.

Teachers would do well to avoid meetings at which questions of an objectionable character are likely to be discussed; but should they happen to be present, their duty clearly requires them to leave the meeting at the earliest moment after its character has become apparent. Failure to do so in future will render the teacher liable to a serious penalty.

The Commissioners also regret to find teachers attending meetings at which the Board and its officers are assailed in a coarse and sneering manner.

Should teachers consider themselves aggrieved, or injured in their positions and prospects, by any regulation of the Commissioners, they can bring the matter under official notice through their managers; and Rule 96 provides ample security against any unreasonable action on the part of the officers of the Commissioners.

The Commissioners hope that such regrettable incidents as those referred to will not occur again, and that the teachers will discharge their important duties in an earnest and faithful manner, showing due regard for the improvement and general welfare of the pupils committed to their care, proper submission to those placed over them, and a loyal respect for the laws and rulers of their country.

P. E. LEMASS,

W. J. DELWORTH,

Secretaries.

Office of National Education,
Dublin, June, 1905.

Belfast Resolution re Board's Circular.

This is what the Belfast Teachers said of the above Circular in a Resolution of 12th July, 1906:—

"That with reference to the circular issued in the name of the Commissioners of National Education, and referring to the incidents alleged at the Sligo Congress, we hereby emphatically declare—1st, That the manner of its publication is needlessly and provokingly offensive to those to whom it is addressed; 2nd, that a rule or regulation which conveys insult and imposes restrictions upon those against whom no shadow of blame or reasonable suspicion can be sustained looks like incapacity of administration, tends to destroy confidence, and if persevered in must weaken the ties of sympathy, which are the best guarantee of wholesome respect for constituted authority; 3rd, that it is contrary to the spirit and genius of British law to condemn without a hearing, or to make no discrimination between those who may have offended and those who never would dream of doing as alleged in the circular; 4th, that the indefinite terms of the circular sweep away the dearest rights of citizenship from an educated and intelligent body of public servants, and we call upon the Commissioners to define accurately what is meant by 'controversy,' 'meetings,' &c., so honest law or rule capable of obedience must be explicit."

Central Executive Resolutions re Action of Dr. Starke.

And this is what the Central Executive say with regard to the Circular and the refusal of Dr. Starke to receive their deputation:—

Proposed by Mr. Murrigh, seconded by Mr. O'Flaherty—Resolved: "That as the Central Secretary has submitted to this Committee 107 cases of teachers who have been deprived of the increments, etc., to which they consider they were justly entitled, and as this Committee authorised the Secretary to bring these cases under the notice of the Resident Commissioner, and that a deputation was appointed from this Committee to wait on him in reference to these cases of alleged injustice, and that as replies have been received from the Resident Commissioner in the early part of this year and at intervals since that time refusing to entertain cases represented by this Committee on the grounds that they should have been presented by the ordinary course, through the respective managers of the teachers concerned, we are surprised to find that the Resident Commissioner now refuses to receive the deputation on the grounds that the Committee did not repudiate the action of those who are alleged to have taken part in 'Objectionable Proceedings' at the Congress Dinner, and for which this Committee is not in any way responsible." It was also decided to print and circulate a pamphlet containing statements of a number of the cases referred to above. Teachers who have already sent in statements and who desire to have them published are directed to communicate with the Central Secretary.

The Circular recently issued by the Board was next considered, and the following resolution in reference to it was adopted:—Proposed by Mr. J. A. Agnew, seconded by Mr. T. O'Flaherty—Resolved: "That we are extremely surprised at the condemnatory tone of the Circular dated 20th June, 1906, to the National Teachers from the Education Office, especially (1) as it has not been proved that any teacher acted disloyally or disrespectfully to the King at the Sligo Congress Banquet; (2) that as regards others, the teachers, no matter how they might differ from them, had no control over, and therefore no responsibility for, their actions; and that we deem it unjust to condemn the leaders of the Organisation for not reviewing the proceedings of the Sligo Congress, and for not pronouncing judgment on alleged acts which, even if proved, the Congress alone had power to deal with, and therefore we respectfully request the withdrawal of the Circular."

Another attempt to get hearing from Board.

On the 2nd September, 1905, the Executive tried again to get a hearing from the whole Board, but were again informed "that it was not the practice of the Commissioners to receive deputations."

Board's Attitude on Salaries in 1905 Report.

In the 1905 Report of the Commissioners twenty paragraphs are devoted to the attempt to prove that Irish teachers were better paid than the English and Scotch, especially in small schools, and for this purpose they took the poorest spots in Great Britain, such as the Isle of Lewis, where there are only seven schools under 50 average, and then from certain premises they triumphantly announce that "for this class of school the salaries are much higher in Ireland than in Lewis," as if a normal district in Ireland was on a par with the isolated little islet of Lewis. This laboured attempt to prove that the teachers had no grounds for complaint as regards salaries in 1905, under the Government of Messrs. Balfour and Wyndham, forms a very curious and inexplicable contrast to the Home Rule Manifesto of August, 1912, in the days of Messrs. Asquith and Burrell, admitting, what the teachers always contended, that half a million more is need to put Irish Education on a financial equality with Great Britain.

YEAR 1906.

Protest against refusal of access to the Rural at Waterford Congress.

At the Waterford Congress, 1906, the following report was adopted by Congress with regard to denial of access to the Board on account of the Sligo Banquet incident:—

"You are already aware that Dr. Starke has refused to confer with us on educational matters. The alleged reason for his present attitude towards the Organisation is not convincing. In seeking to present our views to Dr. Starke we thereby acknowledged and honoured him in his exalted and responsible administrative position, became acquainted with his views on educational matters, were impressed by his courteous manner, and when our conferences ended we always felt that, although we could not indulge the hope of having obtained our suit in full, we were encouraged by the conviction that his sympathy was with us, and that what was withheld was more from necessity than unwillingness on his part. The advantage of conferring with practical educational workers, conversant with every phase of the question, is of infinite value to a protest administrator, as great injury may accrue to education by every theoretic. Dr. Starke, by refusing to confer with your representatives, voluntarily excludes the opportunity of testing and correcting vague theories by practical expert knowledge. Moreover, his decision is to us somewhat of a surprise, as it clearly implies that he gives credence to unauthenticated reports, which we certainly would not have expected him to do. Besides, it is contrary to all proper legal procedure to condemn without a hearing, as Dr. Starke has done, and although in the exercise of his privileges your representatives are shut out from a conference with him, we are not in despair on that account. Dr. Starke several times reminded us, when in his presence, that he was not the only responsible administrator in connection with primary education, and it will be to our advantage to remember that now, and to act accordingly. Your Committee have considered this question, and have formulated a method of procedure to cope with the altered circumstances."

During this year an additional source of discontent arose by the increase in the number of dismissals. Dr. Traill in an address delivered at the Marlboro' Street Training College on the 15th June, 1906, denounced the dismissals, and condemned the degradation of the teacher under the new system of grading.

Dr. Traill on Inefficiency.

Dr. Traill, who was a member of the Board since 1901, says that he had foretold that such a system was bound to fail on the lines on which it had been introduced. He contends that, if introduced at all, it should commence in the training colleges. We must say we never heard of the Provost's prophecy as to the failure of the paper system, but we are in thorough accord with him when he says it should commence, if introduced at all, in the training colleges.

The Provost tells us further:—"I fear that one result of this mistake has been that teachers who had excellent records as teachers for years under the old system have been pronounced inefficient under the new system and dismissed with or without proper pensions, and their schools closed or amalgamated as a result of that enforced inefficiency."

Another matter dwelt upon by the Provost is the injustice of the grading system. He said:—"A teacher who has been classed first of first may now be called third grade because the number of his pupils happens to be small, so that he becomes 'degraded' before the public, who do not understand this change of nomenclature. He or she should be ranked according to their ability as teachers and their learning, and not by the accident that they cannot get large schools. Under the present nomenclature the great bulk of teachers must be third grade."

These utterances of a Commissioner increased the alarm, and a return obtained in Parliament by Mr. T. O'Donnell, M.P., still more accentuated the agitation. The following letter written by the Central Secretary shows the state of feeling at the time:—

Parliamentary Return re Dismissals.

DEGRADATION AND DISMISSAL.

Dear Sir,—The Chief Secretary has issued the following return in reply to a question by Mr. Thomas O'Donnell, M.P.:—

Year.	Teachers dismissed for inefficiency.	Teachers degraded from position of first or second class.	Teachers from whom salary was withdrawn within five years of their maximum service.
	nil.	nil.	nil.
1886	nil.	nil.	nil.
1887	0	nil.	3
1888	16	nil.	1
1889	24	4	6
1890	19	nil.	9
1901	18	2	6
1902	26	1	6
1903	41	5	17
1904	61	8	24
1905	40	2	7

The average service of the teachers included in the last column was 37 years.

It will be seen from this that dismissal on the vague charge of inefficiency has increased 300 per cent. since the new system was introduced in 1880, and that the feeling of insecurity which now paralyses many teachers of long service is by no means an imaginary terror.

In the last column it is shown that sixty teachers, within five years of their maximum service, were forced to retire between 1901 and 1905, as against 17 similarly "retired" in the previous five years. Now, during the last five years of possible service the pension increases with accelerated velocity, and those 60 teachers, who had given on the average 37 years' service each, were driven out on a small fraction of the pension for which they had been paying since 1879, and to which they confidently looked forward as provision for old age.

Grating, what is certainly very questionable, that all these teachers, dismissed on small pension or no pension, failed to accommodate themselves to the new order of things, they yet were entitled to consideration and to some such reasonable treatment as is given to public servants in other departments under similar circumstances. They had served successfully under one system; they were discontinued through the exigencies, real or supposed, of another, and the rule in such cases throughout the public service is to add a number of years to the actual service so as to qualify for full pension. The Teachers' Executive Committee at last meeting put

forward this plea in the following terms:—"That in all cases in which teachers are officially alleged to be 'inefficient' in teaching the numerous school programmes introduced since 1900, there should be a full and impartial investigation; and that should the result be that the teacher be compulsorily retired, more justice, and the precedents established by other public departments demand that at least ten years be added to his (or her) service in calculating the amount of his (or her) pension, and that the extra cost of this arrangement be a charge on Imperial funds." No favour is here brought, the demand is impartial investigation, and the terms of retirement which are freely allowed to all other public servants when thrown out of employment through change of system. Are the teachers alone to be deprived of these common rights?

By a Board's Order of 2nd May, 1899, a very drastic code of "Penalties for Inefficiency" was drawn up and sent as a circular to managers and teachers.

The following are its terms:—

"When the Inspector's report shows that a certain teacher has discharged his school duties in a seriously inefficient manner during the previous year, the official action shall be as follows:—

"(1) On the first occasion the teacher shall be reprimanded, and warned that a serious penalty will be inflicted if the proficiency of the school be not materially improved before the next annual examination of it.

"(2) If, at the following examination, the proficiency be not materially improved and the report be again unsatisfactory, the penalty shall be temporary depression in classification for one or more quarters, with corresponding or appropriate reduction of salary, together with a warning that if the signs of inefficiency are found to continue the depression in classification shall be made permanent after the next annual examination.

"(3) If at an examination following a warning the proficiency of the school be found improved, but after another year is found to have lapsed into an unsatisfactory condition, the penalty threatened will be inflicted. If, on the other hand, the satisfactory standard of proficiency is maintained for two or more years, the series of penalties will commence *de novo*.

"(4) The third penalty for continued inefficiency shall be permanent depression in classification, with a warning that the teacher is retained only on trial for a year.

"(5) The fourth penalty for continued inefficiency shall be dismissal or withdrawal of salary."

Though this order was harsh and threatening it hid one commendable feature—it systematised the procedure against a teacher alleged to be inefficient, and, apparently at least, gave him a chance of relieving his character. The circumstances of the school might make it impossible for the censured teacher to order matters so that the inspector who previously censured him should report "the proficiency materially improved," and if not: then—! It was some advantage, however, to have a warning and three annual trials between the charge of insufficiency and the supreme penalty of dismissal; but it seems the advantage no longer avails, and that the Board's Order of 1899, though never formally withdrawn, is ignored, so far as it is in any degree favourable. I am informed that teachers are now being dismissed, with the brand of inefficiency, after only one bad report, and are denied the slight possible benefit of even that special regulation of the Board, which is formally and essentially a penal enactment. Is the teacher who is charged with inefficiency on an outlaw? If not, he is entitled in more justice to be dealt with according to the strict letter of that law of the Board, which prescribes censure, and depression, or fine, for four years in succession, as the forerunners of ultimate dismissal. I think, too, it will be generally granted that the Teachers' Executive are fully justified in demanding an impartial investigation of every case involving consequences so serious as the dismissal in ignominy of an old, and possibly very capable, teacher.—Yours faithfully,

T. CLARKE.

Beay.

On the 26th September, 1905, the Executive drew up a memorial praying for redress, and appealed to the Board to receive a deputation in support of it, but were again refused.

Justification of Dismissals in 1905 Report.

In the 1906 Report the Board seeks, first, to justify the dismissals; secondly, to cast the odium of them on the managers; thirdly, it seeks to justify the over-riding of the scale of penalties, which gave the teacher three chances, by explaining "that when the system of class salaries was abolished the terms did not apply any longer, but stated that the dismissals did not take place till the cases were personally examined by the Resident Commissioner, thereby proclaiming Dr. Starke as *Ex-Officio* in-Chief of the Department. The Report scouted the idea of any appeal from the Board.

To this the teachers drew up a reply, from which the following are some extracts:—

"The Report quotes the scale of penalties sanctioned by the Board's Order of 2nd May, 1900, and says it naturally fell into disuse with the abolition of the old system. It is surely as easy under the present system to reduce a teacher's salary as it was under the old. Grade salary can be as easily reduced as class salary, and fines can be quite as easily inflicted under the one system as the other, but it is evident a more expeditious mode of dispatch was desired, and hence the new mode of procedure. Certainly, the Commissioners cannot now reproach themselves with 'too much leniency' when teachers of many years' experience are being cast on the mercy of the world at the rate of 50 per annum.

"The Report further says:—'In nearly all cases the dismissal was not ordered till the Senior Inspector had added his opinion to that of the District Inspector.' This implies that some teachers were dismissed on the report of one inspector. The high official who was entrusted with the consideration of the case at headquarters apparently considered only the inspectors' reports; the Resident Commissioner evidently only did the same. What can be the feelings of officials who, on an average for the past three years, have condemned one teacher each week to a life of poverty, misery, and degradation?

"Another singular circumstance is that only in Ireland are dismissals for inefficiency known. Since 1899 only one teacher in Scotland had his certificate withdrawn by the Department, and there was no such case in England, while almost 250 were dismissed in Ireland. Inefficiency might be found under the educational centre of Ireland than where the dismissals have taken place. When twenty-five per cent. of teachers were still without increments nine months after they had earned them, there was evidence of inefficiency at headquarters which should have made officials slower to dismiss those in their power.

"No matter how officials may attempt to disguise the true state of affairs, when fifty teachers can be sent each year to spend the remainder of their days in poverty, or, perhaps, in the workhouse, there is urgent need of a court of appeal, and the clamour raised about the injustice and cruelty of the procedure shall not cease till some more humane and reasonable system be adopted. Teachers are not so inhuman as to see their brothers and sisters condemned by summary process of officials without protesting against the cruelty and injustice, and demanding some efficient remedy."

Resolution requesting Specimen Time-Tables.

During this year, in addition to the agitation against increased dismissals, and the repeated demands for an impartial investigation before final sentence, the Executive, on 1st September, 1905, say:—

"That we request the Commissioners to issue Specimen Time-Tables for the different classes of National Schools, since we find it impossible to teach the over-loaded programme in the ordinary day of four hours. We are still asking these specimen Time-Tables, and have never got them, though time and money are spent in Tyrone House on less necessary publications."

Resolution on want of Uniformity.

This year winds up with the following resolution, which in view of the proved absence of uniformity before this Committee, shows that the teachers in 1906 were not wide or wild in their statements:—

"That the want of uniformity in the inspection system proves inefficiency in the educational administration of the country, and we demand a more equitable system of awarding merit, and some effective means to be adopted of providing an appeal against the decisions of harsh, over-zealous inspectors, whose character must be known in the Education Office."

YEAR 1907.

Mr. Birrell's promise at Teachers' Congress.

This year opened auspiciously for the teachers. Mr. Birrell, the new Chief Secretary, attended the Teachers' Congress in Dublin, and his sympathetic address gave them courage and hope. He characterized the restrictions on their civil liberty as "absurd, unreasonable, and unfair." He promised a grant for increasing salaries and providing scholarships. He promised that, having taken up the cause of education, he would never lay it down, and hope to come to them before long, not only with sympathetic words, but with toll hands. On the 27th April of that year Dr. Starke promised, through the intervention of Mr. Murphy, M.P., newly elected Parliamentary Secretary to the teachers, that he would open the door again to the teachers' deputations, but another incident set the teachers up against him again.

Dr. Starke at the Federal Conference, 1907.

On Empire Day, 1907, at the Federal Conference of Education in London, attended, like the British Association, by educationists from the ends of the earth, the "London Times" reported Dr. Starke as having amused his audience both at the Banquet and the Conference by ridiculing the Irish managers, the Irish teachers, and the Irish National school pupils.

Teachers' repudiation of his Statements.

The Teachers' Executive, on the 8th June, repudiated his libels in the following resolution:—

Proposed by Mr. Cunningham, seconded by Mr. O'Callaghan—resolved:—"That having read the speeches of Dr. Starke at the recent British Federal Conference on Education, as reported in the Irish newspapers, reflecting on the National teachers and elementary education in Ireland, we, in the absence of any correction or repudiation thereof by the Resident Commissioner, hereby express our emphatic condemnation of the language ascribed to him in casting aspersions upon us, and the effort made to demean us in the eyes of the public. We also beg to assure Dr. Starke that we are neither indifferent to our civil rights, nor satisfied with our present salaries, which, in his opinion seem, adequate."

"That, notwithstanding statements reported to be made by the Resident Commissioner, that the teachers were not very much oppressed by the denial of civil rights, we hereby declare that we consider our deprivation of the rights, which the meanest citizen enjoys, and which are not withheld from teachers in England and Scotland, as a most grievous injustice; that we are determined to use every means in our power to get rid of this grave disability, and we request the aid of every Irishman in removing the badge of slavery which tends to the degradation of the teachers of the nation."

Catholic Managers' Resolution calling for his removal.

At the same time the clerical managers called for Dr. Starke's removal at two successive meetings of their body:—

"That we have learned with surprise that Mr. Bryce, the late Chief Secretary, told the House of Commons in August last that the continuance in office of the present Resident Commissioner was not objected to by the Catholic managers of Ireland. That we direct our secretaries to draw the attention

of Mr. Birrell to the resolution we had unanimously adopted at our previous meeting on June the 5th, and which had been duly forwarded to Mr. Bryen. That we renew that resolution (a copy of which is submitted) regarding the usefulness of Dr. Staikie for his present position, and the difficulty of managers and the Board acting in harmony in the work of education as long as he continues to exercise authority or control. That his recent utterances in London as representative of the Board, when he sneered at the character of his countrymen after the manner of the stage Irishman, and spoke of the managers of the National schools of Ireland with studied affront and sarcasm, confirm us in regarding him as unfit for his present position. That we earnestly hope that the sentiments of Dr. Staikie and his manner of expressing them find no favour with any other member of the National Board."

The following is the resolution referred to above:—

"That, as a new Government has recently come into office, our secretary be directed to bring under the notice of the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland the profound and widespread dissatisfaction that exists amongst the Catholic clerical school managers at the continuance in office of Dr. Staikie, Resident Commissioner, who unanimously shamed us in a public address delivered in Belfast in 1903, and by the aid of garbled and distorted official documents not then, nor for months after, available to the public. In that address he sneered at our exertions to work and adorn our churches, and almost avowed his desire to deprive us of our position and powers as school managers. His conduct, unsupported, makes impossible the existence of such good-will and cordial feeling as the interests of education require, between the virtual head of the Education Department and the managers of the vast majority of the schools of Ireland."

Transition Teachers' Memorial.

During this year the Executive made another attempt to gain address for the transition teachers. In the 1904 report the Commissioners published a table showing the average incomes for schools of 35 and 70, respectively, under the old system. Basing their calculations on this table, 76 transition teachers sent in an estimate of their losses under the new system. The Executive drew up a memorial and presented it to the Chief Secretary and the Commissioners, but without result. We also got counsel's opinion as to whether the arrears could be recovered, but our counsel invariably informs us that the law of the land affords us no protection from the rule of the National Board.

Resolution and Parliamentary Question in appeal for Re-Inspection.

The resolutions this year (4th May, 1907), deal with various complaints of dissatisfaction at present prevailing throughout Ireland in consequence of the present practice of the Board in refusing a re-inspection in many cases where it is alleged teachers have been unjustly treated by the report or remarks of an inspector, causing the non-allowance of increments or promotion, nay, even leading up to depression or dismissal, we believe that reverting to the old custom of granting a right of appeal in all such cases would have with a moderating effect on the denunciations of inspectors generally as to reduce the number of such complaints and grievances to a minimum; and we demand that in all cases where the two previous reports of a teacher were up to the standard required to obtain promotion, no teacher should be disallowed such promotion in consequence of a less favourable report by any inspector on his first visit to a school, as on such occasions it is well known many inspectors are over-correcting.

We made an attempt to get the matter exposed by a Parliamentary question, but the information was refused:—

Re-inspection of Schools—Questions and Reply.

Q.—Mr. Murphy.—To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether National school teachers are allowed by the Commissioners of

National Education to appeal against an inspection; and if he can state how many applications for re-inspection were received during the past year, and how many re-inspections were ordered by the Commissioners (6th May, 1907).

A.—Mr. Birrell.—The Commissioners of National Education inform me that, under their regulations, any teacher who feels aggrieved by the conduct of the inspector can appeal through the manager to the Commissioners. When such an appeal is made, the Commissioners carefully consider all the circumstances of the case, and, if they deem it necessary, they instruct one of the senior or chief inspectors to visit the school and make a special report. The Commissioners are unable to say how many applications for re-inspection were received from teachers during the past year. In order to do so, a close scrutiny of all the letters received from teachers would be necessary. The Commissioners, however, are prepared to report upon any specific case which the honourable member may have in view. (6th May, 1907.)

YEAR 1906.

Teachers' proposed distribution of Birrell Grant.

This year is characterised by another row with the Commissioners, this time over the allocation of the Birrell Grant. On the 7th December, 1907, the Teachers' Executive met and drew up the following scheme for the allocation of the prospective grant:—

"STATEMENT by the Central Executive Committee of the Irish National Teachers' Organisation, in reference to the proposed additional Grant for Primary Education.

"In reference to the proposed increase in next year's Estimates, we demand that it shall be of such an amount as to make the entire sum equal to that given to Scotland for similar purposes.

"We desire to state also that any satisfactory allocation of the proposed increased Grant should proceed on the following lines:—

- "(1) To provide that increments given to teachers the salaries of all principal and assistant teachers.
- "(2) To provide that increments given to teachers should be substantially increased and should be annual; and
- "(3) To provide a sufficient sum to enable the present unjust barriers to promotion to be removed.

"We desire to say that we are pleased to hear of the proposed increase in the present inadequate initial salaries; but we emphatically declare that any attempt to deal with that point alone without touching the questions and increments, and the all-round increase of salaries also, would be most unsatisfactory, and would lead to continued discontent.

"Signed on behalf of the Irish National Teachers' Organisation, this 7th day of December, 1907.

"P. GAMBER, President.

"T. CLARKE, Secretary.

Board's proposed allocation by Capitation.

A deputation in support of this visited on Dr. Staikie on the 14th December, 1907. Dr. Staikie told them that the Board had already decided that the Grant was to be distributed in capitation, as the Treasury preferred a rough and ready scheme that would not involve much trouble. The teachers condemned this method of allocation as unduly favouring large schools. In the end of June, 1908, the Board's proposed method of allocation became public through Parliament, and in the words of a letter which I wrote, July 4th, 1908, "No words can describe the paralysis which seized the teachers of Ireland when they learned that the 2,887 teachers of schools under 36 were to be excluded from any participation in the increased grant." The estimate was withdrawn and sent back to the Commissioners for amendment.

In the meantime the Teachers' Executive adopted the following resolution:—

Proposed by Mr. Moriagh, seconded by Mr. Doyle:—"That we, the members of the Central Executive Committee of the Irish National Teachers' Organisation, not only protest in the strongest possible manner against the inadequacy of the Supplementary Estimate for increasing the salaries of the Irish National teachers, but also against the mode of allocation as being a gross injustice to the principals of all schools with an average under 35, as well as to a large number of assistant teachers, in depriving them of any benefit whatever from the grant. That we consider the most equitable division of the grant would be by an equal increase to the salaries of all teachers, irrespective of average, position, or grade, and not by capitation or bonus to a particular section of the teachers, as proposed by the Commissioners. We therefore request the Irish Members of Parliament to make every effort to have the grant so distributed pending a proper adjustment of salaries amongst all teachers in the service."

Executive Resolution and Deputation to London.

A deputation proceeded to London to interview Mr. Birrell in support of this resolution. They saw him on Wednesday 22nd July. They pointed out to him that an agitation for an increase in initial salaries had been going on for years, that in response to this agitation he promised the Grant at the Teachers' Congress to increase initial salaries and salaries of poorly paid teachers, that these would be excluded by the scheme of the Commissioners, and that as the Grant was so small and the Treasury wanted a simple scheme, the equal dividend method would approach not indeed justice, but the least injustice to the most needy. He promised them that the revision of the estimate would follow mainly in accordance with the views put before him by the teachers.

Revised Estimate introduced by Mr. Birrell, 24th July, 1908.

The second proposal of the Commissioners was then dropped, and two days after the reception of the deputation Mr. Birrell brought in the revised estimate himself which gave satisfaction, and the Grant was paid with the October salaries for the year 1908. During the time that the method of allocation was in dispute the small school teachers and the assistants were in a state of great unrest, and the Press was full of letters protesting against their proposed exclusion.

Commissioners' attitude re Birrell Grant.

In the 1908 report the Commissioners state:—"After considerable correspondence we succeeded in securing a Grant of £114,000." And then after referring to the rejection of their first and second proposals for its distribution they continue:—

Commissioners' Complaint of Abandonment of Government re Birrell Grant.

We think it to be our duty to protest most strongly against the abandonment by the Government, without consultation with us, of this essential part of our scheme in favour of an addition to the increases of salaries in the third and second of first grade, which, on account of its insignificance (£1 in 3rd grade; £2 in second of 1st grade), will be productive of little effect. We consider this action on the part of the Government to be an infringement, unparalleled in our history, of the spirit of the original constitution on which the Board was founded, viz., that it should be entrusted with absolute control over the funds which might be annually voted by Parliament.*

* Note.—See the letter from the Chief Secretary for Ireland, to His Grace the Duke of Leinster, on the formation of a Board of Commissioners for Education in Ireland. (Report of the Royal Commission on Primary Education, 1876, Vol. I, p. 25.)

The Commissioners had nothing to do with the obtaining of the Grant. Mr. Birrell promised it to the teachers, he gave it to the teachers, and he distributed it according to the wishes of the teachers, and the Commissioners had no grounds whatever for claiming a right to distribute it in defiance to the wishes of the teachers who won it.

Usefulness and Fidelity of Teachers during Birrell Grant Agitation.

The agitation over the allocation of the Birrell Grant is one of the most honoured periods in the history of the Organisation. Although 1,300 large school teachers stood to win by the capitation and bonus scheme, not one of them ever raised a voice or wrote a line—though the Press was filled with letters for months, and there were great differences about the most equitable method of distribution—in favour of the Commissioners' proposal. The big men of the profession disclaimed all desire to seize on the major portion of the grant at the expense of their more needy brethren. This was the first crisis in which I had the opportunity of testing the pulse of the Organisation, and it was their behaviour in that crisis, their usefulness, and loyalty, and unity, that first fired me with a burning desire to free them from the thralldom of the yoke of the National Board, and I determined thenceforth to see "that one talent" God gave me in the struggle for their freedom. I hope and trust that the findings of this Commission will bring us in sight of that long-desired goal.

Mr. Birrell's Compliment to the Large School Teachers over their solidarity and esprit-de-corps.

Mr. Birrell paid a tribute to the big men of our body at the time. Speaking in the House of Commons of the revised method of distribution he said:—"Of course, the teachers in the larger schools would get less, but he was glad to think that they had sufficient solidarity and esprit-de-corps to be willing, for the present at all events, to submit to that reduction."

Agreement Forms for Teachers.

At the deputation in December, 1907, Dr. Starkie discussed the agreement forms. In consequence of his observations the Catholic teachers at Killymore Congress held a private meeting, and decided to stand by Forms 1 and 2. Arising out of this deputation, the Connaught managers passed the following resolution in May, 1908:—

Connaught Managers' Resolution calling for Dr. Starkie's Removal.

Proposed by Monsignor McLaughlin, seconded by Monsignor O'Hare:—

"That this meeting expresses its satisfaction at the action of the Catholic Teachers attending the recent Congress at Killymore in unanimously approving of No. 2 Form of Agreement between Managers and Teachers. This unanimous approval of the Catholic Teachers is all the more valuable, in the opinion of the Managers, as it is in striking opposition to the mischievous advice given by Mr. Starkie to the Teachers' deputation that waited on him on 14th December last, when he urged them, in their private conference, to insist on the withdrawal of Forms Nos. 1 and 2, and to call at once on the Commissioners to make the new Forms Nos. 3 and 4 compulsory. Mr. Starkie's presence in the Education Office is a menace and a danger to Catholic faith. We shall never cease, as long as he remains there, to call for his removal."

YEAR 1909.

Deputation to Dr. Starkie, 1909.

Verbal Report to Sub-Committee.

During this year occurred an incident which resulted in the banning of the Teachers' Representatives by Dr. Starkie once again.

On the 6th February, 1909, I went on my first and last deputation to Dr. Starkie. I took notes of the proceedings during the progress of the interview.

When we returned from the Education Office we made a verbal report to a Sub-Committee that were engaged that day drafting the Congress Programme. At the next full meeting of the Teachers' Executive on February 27th my report of the deputation was ordered to be printed and circulated to the Secretaries of the Associations marked "Private and Confidential."

Deputation to the President Commissioners.

A report of the recent interview with Dr. Sturkie was sent forward by the Secretary to the deputation, Mr. John Murphy, M.P., who could not conveniently attend this meeting. A fuller report presented by Miss Mahon, attended in a few respects by Mr. Gamble and Mr. O'Callaghan, who were also members of the deputation, was submitted and approved. The Central Secretary will send copies (confidentially) to Secretaries of Associations immediately on receiving the amended draft.

Proposed by Mr. Ramsey, seconded by Mr. Mansfield-Bell—Resolved:—"That the report of the deputation to Dr. Sturkie, read by Miss Mahon, be adopted, and that a copy, marked 'private and confidential,' be sent to the Secretary of each Association."

Inadvertent Omission of Private and Confidential. Steps taken to rectify Omission.

When Dr. Clarke had it ready he sent it down to me to look through it, and to send it on direct to the printer. I did so, and it was only when I got some copies in print that I noticed the omission of the "Private and Confidential" mark. Immediately I wrote to Dr. Clarke, drawing his attention to the omission. Dr. Clarke marked all the copies in his possession in red ink, and despatched Post Cards in red ink to the Secretaries, asking them to do likewise. I also put a note in the Irish School Weekly to the same effect. That should have been ample statement for an inadvertent omission.

Fr. Curry's Letter to Civil Rights—P. Doherty's Allusion to Fr. Curry's Letter—Dr. Sturkie's Contradiction—Correspondence.

In that report it is mentioned that Dr. Sturkie and the managers were against "Civil Rights" for teachers, and that they had strong representation on the Board. The contents of this report were circulated by the Secretaries to all the teachers, and Fr. Curry, P.P., heard about the accusation against the managers, and contradicted it, as far as the Catholic managers were concerned, in the *Freeman* of April 15th, 1909. Dr. Sturkie took no notice of this contradiction, and made no move whatever in the matter till Mr. Doherty, of Tipperary, opened up the affair again in the *Freeman* on the 16th July, 1909. In the *Freeman* of the next day Dr. Sturkie's Private Secretary, Mr. Pellan, contradicted Mr. Doherty's quotation. On the 22nd I wrote affirming the accuracy of my report. A couple of further letters from Mr. Doherty ended Part I. of this drama.

Resolution of C.E.C. affirming accuracy of my Report—Gamble's Letter.

At the next Central Committee meeting on the 31st July, 1909, the members of the committee unanimously passed a resolution, an affidavit I might almost call it, affirming the correctness of my report. On the 10th August, 1909, Mr. Gamble, of Cork, wrote to the *Freeman*, half affirming, half denying, Dr. Sturkie's statement. Mr. Elliott, President at the time, wound up Part II. with a letter in support of my report.

Omission of private mark not source of publicity— Indiscreet Correspondent Managers and previous Report.

I wish to point out that it was not the omission of the "Private and Confidential" mark, but the assertion re managers, that caused the trouble. The previous deputation report, December, 1907, was marked "Private and Confidential," yet its contents became known to the Correspondent managers, and called forth their resolution of May, 1908. On that occasion also Mr. Gamble put a letter in *Freeman* in favour of Dr. Sturkie.

My Fault in Dr. Sturkie's eyes.

My fault, in Dr. Sturkie's eyes, lay, as will be seen later, in my vindication of my own honour. He seems to hold the view that when the truth inconvenient to the official, those under him should allow him to impugn their veracity without right of vindication of their character. In Dr. Sturkie's case he has absolute power owing to the supineness of a pliable Board, who delegated to him all their responsibility before God and man to protect those placed under their care by the State, and to see that the Ten Commandments are observed in dealing with them.

YEAR 1910.

Case of Miss Shanahan, B.B., and Appointment of Arbitration Committee.

About this time Miss Shanahan, of Mullinahona N.S., B.B., was threatened with dismissal by the Board if she did not qualify to teach Irish by a certain specified date. This contravened the teachers' agreement to the pressure of the Gaelic League on the National Board.

Deputation from Arbitration Committee to Dr. Sturkie. Dr. Sturkie bans me, and my action at the time.

To save this teacher, and to adjust some other differences, an Arbitration Committee was appointed, consisting of two teachers from the Gaelic League, two from the Teachers' Organisation, with Professor MacNeill as Chairman. I was a member of, and acted as Secretary to, this Committee, and in that capacity I applied to Dr. Sturkie to receive the Committee as a deputation to discuss the B.B. case. Dr. Sturkie wrote back saying he would not see me. I knew that the other three teachers would not go without me if they knew I was banned, and the matter was very grave, as Miss Shanahan's eviction notice would soon expire, so I took on myself the responsibility of dropping out and arranging the interview for the other four members for the 2nd July, 1909, and notified them of the arrangement.

Mr. McGowan's Report of Deputation and Dr. Sturkie's amendation introduced.

Mr. McGowan acted as secretary on this deputation. To avoid any further unpleasantness, he submitted a draft of his report to Dr. Sturkie. He got it back totally changed, and when he submitted Dr. Sturkie's amended version to the Executive we could not accept it. Dr. Sturkie had promised the deputation that if an Irish-speaking assistant were appointed in Mullinahona to deal with the juniors, "Miss Shanahan could deal with the senior division on ordinary lines."

When Mr. McGowan sent Dr. Sturkie the draft of the report, he introduced, as an amendment, "Miss Shanahan could deal with the senior division on ordinary lines for the next twelve months, during which time she should take steps to acquire a sufficient knowledge of Irish."

Nature of Dr. Sturkie's amendment and effect on Miss Shanahan.

The deputation most emphatically rejected that alternative. Miss Shanahan was a teacher of 17 years' service; she could not qualify for Bilingualism in 12 months, and to try to do so with the sword of dismissal hanging over her head all the time would impair her health, to the detriment of her school. He agreed to the extension of any threat of the kind on the representations of the deputation, yet when they were gone out of his sight he introduced it again.

Second Deputation of Arbitration Committee—Dr. Sturkie's coming out of amendment.

The Arbitration Committee had to meet again, and the deputation had to go back to Dr. Sturkie again on the 17th September, 1910, to get the report returned to the original agreement. Dr. Sturkie crossed out the amendment, and initiated the crossing.

I notice in the report of the last deputation, July, 1913, Dr. Sturkie repeats the conditions which he struck out under his initials in September, 1910. If premises can bind him, it is fortunate for Miss

Shamshan that I have such a propensity for preserving documents, as she is under threat of eviction again.

The fourth and final act of this drama between Dr. Starke and the Executive over my report occurred on the 5th November, 1910.

Dr. Starke's refusal to receive Deputation from Central Committee, including me.—Action of Central Secretary.

A deputation was appointed in October, 1910, and when Mr. Doyle applied for reception of the deputation Dr. Starke replied that he would see the deputation if Mr. O'Callaghan and myself—members of the 1909 deputation—were excluded. Mr. Doyle wired the members, and afterwards called a special meeting to decide.

Refusal of Central Committee to allow Dr. Starke to ban members from Deputation.

At that meeting on 5th November, 1910, it was decided by resolution to send no deputation to Dr. Starke while he banned any member of the Executive. In other words, they declined to allow Dr. Starke to establish a right of admission and rejection from among the elected representatives of the Teachers' Organisation. An interchange of correspondence took place between Dr. Starke and myself, and the doors of Tyne House were banged against us, except at the price of our honour and independence. We decided never again to seek an interview with Dr. Starke; neither did we ever since, neither shall we ever again, I hope.

Refusal of Central Committee to give Dr. Starke a finger in our Organisation.

Allowing Dr. Starke to ban certain members from deputations would mean that, if any value was to be set on deputations, those in disfavour with Dr. Starke should not be elected on the Executive, and this would ultimately mean giving Dr. Starke a veto in the elections of our Central Committee, and practically making the Organisation an annex of the Education Office, a sort of back-kitchen to Tyne House. We shrank clear of that. He has ample sway over us, without allowing him to interfere in our exercise of the legitimate right of combination.

Rejection of Central Committee's attitude by Organisation at Bangor Congress.

In the report of the Central Executive to the Bangor Congress in 1911 the following paragraphs explain our attitude clearly and temperately on the matter:—

DEPUTATION TO THE RESIDENT COMMISSIONER.

At our meeting of the 8th October a deputation of four members was unanimously appointed to discuss many matters with the Resident Commissioner.

The Resident Commissioner refused to see one of the members of the deputation. A majority of your Committee decided, in the circumstances, that the other three members should not proceed. In their opinion, sending the other members would constitute a recognition of the Resident Commissioner's power to veto our appointments on deputations to him, and in the interests of independence in the Organisation they refused to do it.

They felt that if deputations to the Resident Commissioner were to be a recognised part of the work of the Committee, members whom the Resident Commissioner refused to see (and two prominent members are already tabooed), would be largely useless on the Committee, and this fact would interfere seriously with the free selection by the teachers of their officers and representatives.

We regret the crux, but our first duty is to the Organisation, whose management we have endeavoured to keep free from outside power.

Herewith is appended the entire correspondence connected with and arising out of the Deputation of 6th February, 1908.—C. M. Mahon.

I.

REPORT OF DEPUTATION TO DR. STARKE, Resident Commissioner of National Education, 6th February, 1908.

On Saturday, 6th February, 1908, a deputation, consisting of Miss C. M. Mahon, Messrs. P. Gamble, G. O'Callaghan, and J. Murphy, M.P., had an interview with Dr. Starke at the Education Office. Mr. Dilworth was present at the interview.

Estimates.

Mr. Murphy opened the business of the deputation by asking Dr. Starke what proposals were made in the Estimates for the coming year.

In reply to questions put by Mr. Murphy, Dr. Starke stated:—

Binnell Grant.

- (a) That there was no proposal made to change the allocation of the Binnell Grant.
- (b) That there was no application made for provision of quarterly payment of that Grant;
- (c) That the Treasury gave the payment for the year ended March, 1908, on condition that no demand would be made for more than £114,000 in any one year, and that to make provision for quarterly payments one year's estimate should include £114,000 + £95,000;

Pensions.

- (d) That the Commissioners have removed their proposals of last year with reference to the "added years" up to a maximum of ten in the case of Pensions,

Deputation to Chancellor.

- (e) That he did not think that he or any of the Commissioners would accompany the Teachers' Deputation to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but that the Commissioners might send a deputation on their own account. He could only lay the matter before the Board, as he could not give any promise without consulting the other members of the Board;

Bonuses.

- (f) That the Commissioners have removed their application for Bonuses for Large Schools.

Promotions.

Miss Mahon here intervened and pointed out that before Bonuses were talked of for Large Schools promotions should be arranged by merit and seniority, and that if the Commissioners wished to remove the objection to these Bonuses, Efficient Assistants and Efficient Principals of Small Schools should get preference in appointment to Large Schools. She pointed out that the Commissioners had a rule which would go some way towards meeting the case if enforced; that on exceptional grounds a teacher from a Training College should serve some period of probation under an experienced teacher; that such an arrangement would make for efficiency, as Assistants might naturally be expected to perform their duties with greater zeal if they had a prospect of reward before them.

Dr. Starke replied that if a man without experience was appointed to a Large School, he got no reward if he showed no merit. At the same time he favoured their principle of reward for merit. He told Mr. Dilworth to make a note of the points put before him, and said that the Commissioners could make a rule on the subject.

Monthly Salaries.

Mr. Murphy next asked if the Commissioners made any application to have salaries paid monthly, and Mr. O'Callaghan took this up.

In answer to Mr. O'Callaghan's representations, Dr. Starke replied that the payment of monthly salaries would add £5,000 annually to the cost of administration. He yielded so far as to say that if

the teachers agitate for monthly salaries and monthly payment of the Burrell Grant, the Commissioners will support us, and he advised us to secure Mr. Burrell's support also.

Mr. O'Callaghan asked if the Commissioners would not go further and apply for this concession for us.

Dr. Starke seemed to believe that this would not be of any use; that any concession involving additional expenditure cannot be obtained by mere application of Commissioners, but must first be secured by active agitation on the part of the teachers.

(N.B.—This note ran through many of Dr. Starke's observations during the interview in reference to questions of money.)

Payment of Salaries direct to Teachers.

Mr. Gamble here interposed and asked to have the salaries sent direct to the teachers. Dr. Starke replied that he might as well try to convert the whole Managerial System as to try to pay salaries direct; that it would cause a revolt among Managers throughout the country, and that it was a thing that could only be done by Parliament.

Character Query.

Mr. Gamble asked to have the Character query eliminated. Dr. Starke replied that he did not think much of it, but at the same time he did not think it would be much gain to have it removed, as any manager who wanted to complain of a teacher always had pen and ink at his disposal.

Swearing of Schools.

Mr. Gamble asked to have the rule re swearing of schools abolished in addition to that of re hearing. Dr. Starke admitted that the teachers had a grievance in this matter, and stated that in motoring through England he always in passing a school late in the evening saw a paid woman sweeping and dusting the school. He advised us to bring the matter under the notice of the Women's National Health Association, and try and secure the co-operation of this Association in having the schools properly heated and cleaned.

Civil Rights.

Mr. Gamble next introduced the question of Civil Rights for Teachers. He pointed out to Dr. Starke that if teachers were at liberty to sit on public Boards as Urban, District, and County Councillors, and to take part in the election of Members of Parliament, Primary Education would soon benefit financially. He also pointed out that the only place in which the parents could be effectively reached, or their sympathies enlisted on behalf of their children's educational advancement, was on the public platform. He showed how the so-called Development Grant of £185,000 was lost to Irish education, with the sanction of the Irish Members of Parliament, because the teachers were prohibited by rules from educating the public, and were consequently of no account in the eyes of their Parliamentary representatives. He referred to the fact that now again the eyes of politicians are fixed on the Equivalent Grants due to Irish education, and that if the teachers are not allowed to use the platform and the Press to expose this injustice and to rouse the people to make a stand against it, the danger is, that these Grants will be grabbed again, without any effective protest in Parliament.

Dr. Starke stated that the managers were opposed to the granting of Civil Rights, and mentioned that they had strong representations on the Board. He instanced the case of a manager who said, "How could he sit on the above Board with the teacher who was in his employment?" He also said that Mr. Burrell did us harm instead of good over the Civil Rights question, as he set up the backs of the Members of the Board by his remarks on this question.

Advancing to the Development Grant, Dr. Starke, turning to Mr. Murphy, said, that undoubtedly the Irish Members of Parliament were responsible for the loss of the £185,000; that it was with their consent it was diverted from Irish education and used for Land Act purposes.

"Does this show," said Mr. Gamble, "that the Irish teachers, who understood and explained the situation at the time, are politically of no account in the eyes of Parliamentarians, because by the rules of the National Board they can exercise no influence over Members in their constituencies?"

Dr. Starke was at one with Mr. Gamble as to the necessity of safeguarding the Education Grants, but with regard to the removal of the civil disabilities, he remained that he was not the Board, and could only lay these matters before the Commissioners. At the same time he laid out no more, because the opposition is too strong in the quarters already indicated in the granting of civil and political freedom to the Irish National teacher.

Cookery and Laundry.

Mr. Murphy next introduced the subject of Cookery, and Miss Mahon took this up. She stated among other things that:—

- (a) Cookery and Laundry were technical subjects that do not come within the scope of a Primary school, and were not included in the curriculum of a Primary school in any other country;
- (b) That in other countries there are special subjects taught by special teachers in special centres;
- (c) That a Department exists in this country that specialises in domestic training, and that the overlapping of the two Boards is an unnecessary waste of funds;
- (d) That it was impossible to teach Cookery and Laundry in a one-roomed school, and that it was a violation of hygienic principles to attempt to do so;
- (e) That it was most unfair to try to force teachers, by withholding their incomes, to introduce Cookery and Laundry into their schools, and to provide equipment, fuel, materials at their own expense;
- (f) That the regulations re teaching of these subjects were in the Commissioners' rules for the last three years, and were in abeyance till coming towards the end of the triennial period for awarding increments;
- (g) That children attend school very irregularly, and that they cannot attain any proficiency in reading, writing, and arithmetical if they specialise along domestic lines at 11 years of age;
- (h) That 14 years of age and upwards was the proper time for such specialisation.

Dr. Starke met each of these points as addressed. He said he was aware that Cookery and Laundry were not Primary school subjects in other countries, but that this country was different from any other:

- (a) In other countries there were Higher Schools, Continuation Schools, and centres for special subjects, but in this country no money could be procured for the establishment of such schools, and the National school was the only school available for the majority of children;
- (b) That Cookery was more important than Reading, Writing, and Arithmetic;
- (c) That girls go to work in factories and other places at 14 years of age;
- (d) That the Consultative Committee (consisting of representatives of the National Board and of the Department) pronounced in favour of Cookery and Laundry in National schools;
- (e) That the Department was urging the Board to this course so that girls might be prepared for their instructions when they left the National schools;
- (f) That it was most unfair, he agreed, to expect teachers to be at a penny loss in introducing or carrying on these subjects;
- (g) That the children should be made to bear some of the expense.

(Miss Mahon here pointed out that teachers had very often to supply the books and copy-books to the children out of their own pockets. Dr. Starke replied that if they had, the Commissioners do not hear of it.)

- (4) That there is a great waste of food in places such as Convent schools and other places in the West, where the people live on tea and bread made with water, because they do not know how to cook;
- (5) That he motored through English villages, and that he was centuries behind the English in civilization in some ways.
(Mr. Murphy took him up here, and said, that he, too, had been in English villages, and that he saw none of this superiority in civilization. Dr. Starke, said, of course, the Irish were intellectually superior, but as regards civilization in the cooking of food the English were ahead.)
- (6) That it was useless saying that Cookery could not be taught in a one-roomed school; that he motored through the country, and saw Cookery efficiently taught in numerous one-roomed schools, on ordinary grates; and that the teachers told him they were opposed to it at first, but that now they are delighted to be teaching it.
- (7) That he assured us that not one Increment, otherwise deserved, has been denied owing to the absence of Cookery, and that he ought to know.
(Miss Mahon here stated that she knew teachers who got three and four consecutive "Good" Reports, and have not got Increments owing to the absence of Cookery.)
(He said these teachers were only threatened and the Increments deferred, and that threatening was different from actually doing. Miss Mahon asked him was it fair to threaten teachers to force them to provide equipment and other things necessary. He said it was not, but if the teacher told the Inspector that the only obstacle was the expense of these things, that would send the Inspector on to the manager.)
- (8) That the Department took over the Cookery some time ago, but gave it up again, as the five shillings per head would not cover the cost.
- (Miss Mahon asked him if the five shillings would not cover the cost for the Department, how could it cover the cost in the National schools. Dr. Starke replied, that the small amount of Cookery required in the National schools was entirely different from the full course required in the Technical Schools.)
- (9) That it was useless to agitate for the abolition of Cookery and Laundry from the programme, as he saw advocated in the *School Journal*, but that an agitation for Equipment Grants and suitable provision would be much better advised.
- (10) That some members of the Board, Sir William Butler especially, were most enthusiastic on the matter of domestic training, and that they meant to enforce the regulations.

Mr. Gamble here interposed, and asked Dr. Starke could Experimental Science be dropped if Cookery were taken up; that in Cork the organisers were trying to enforce Cookery on teachers who had already Needlework and Science in addition to the ordinary subjects of an overloaded programme.

Dr. Starke said he thought so, and that they could also submit a modified programme in the other subjects; that, of course, the official programme represented the maximum of the Commissioners' demand. He also remarked that he saw some Cookery in the Cork district which was very successfully taught, with very simple contrivances, which pleased him very much.

The only tangible result of this discussion was that Dr. Starke said:—

- (1) The rule making Increments depend on it would not appear next time;
- (2) That Inspectors would be instructed not to press Cookery and Laundry where Managers refuse to supply equipment and make provision for their introduction;
- (3) That these subjects would not be required in any school in which there were not 12 girls over 11 years of age;
- (4) That where introduced Experimental Science could be dropped, and a modified programme in the other subjects submitted.

Lay Assistants in Convents.

Mr. Gamble mentioned the fact that the Lay Assistants in Convents did not receive any portion of the Burrell Grant.

Dr. Starke said he understood that they had been paid their portion of it by the Nuns, at least in some cases.

Mr. Gamble pointed out that the Commissioners could ensure that they get it in future by amending the rule so as to increase the minimum salary of Lay Assistants from £30 to £37.

Dr. Starke took a note of it, and promised to lay it before the Commissioners.

Rigidity of Averages.

On the question of rigidity of averages, Miss Mahon asked that a saving of five or more should be allowed in the average in case of Assistants who have given at least three years' service, and Mr. O'Callaghan pointed out the benefit, educationally, that would be conferred on the schools, without any additional cost to the Treasury, if Assistants were even paid their salary reduced by one-fifth for each unit, rather than have salary withdrawn altogether.

Dr. Starke said that he knew the loss it was to education to have the services of an Assistant dispensed with, but stated that this was a Treasury matter, and that if the Commissioners were to allow either of these concessions, the Treasury would surcharge them. He stated also that as the Balm stood now the average should be down for four quarters before salary would be withdrawn.

Undergraded and Transition Teachers.

Mr. O'Callaghan presented the cases of the Undergraded and Transition Teachers in the terms of the memorials on their behalf.

Dr. Starke promised to give these memorials the fullest consideration.

Personal Cases.

Mr. Gamble and Mr. O'Callaghan presented cases of teachers dismissed for alleged falsification of accounts.

Dr. Starke held the cases fully proved from a pile of documentary evidence which he had before him.

Mr. Murphy presented several personal cases, which were taken notes of by Mr. Dillworth of Dr. Starke's command.

Thanks.

Mr. Murphy thanked Dr. Starke for the courtesy with which he received the deputation, and the patience and attention with which he listened to them during an interview of nearly three hours' duration.

(Signed),

CATHERINE M. MAHON,
C.E.C.

The foregoing Report was drawn up by Miss C. M. Mahon on behalf of the deputation, and unanimously adopted by the C.E.C. at their meeting on Saturday, 27th February, 1930.

THOMAS CLARKE, LL.D.,
Central Secretary.

27th March, 1930.

April 3, 1930.

REPORT OF DEPUTATION TO EDUCATION OFFICE.

CASBARI, BIRM.,
27th March, 1930.

DEAR MR. EAGAN.—When sending the proof of the above-named Report to the printer, I inadvertently omitted the words *Private and Confidential*, which, according to the terms of the Resolution of the C.E.C. of 27th February, should have been marked on it.

The underlined portions of the Report were specially mentioned as confidential by the Resident Commissioner, at the interview on the 6th February, 1930; therefore, I would ask secretaries and delegates to write the words *Private and Confidential* at the top of the Reports received by them.

This will make the matter all right, as the words serve their purpose just as well written as printed, and when so marked the document cannot be published in the Press. This is the only difference the marking really makes, as the matter of the Report must of necessity otherwise be well ventilated. So I ask the associates and delegates, as a point of honour, to kindly rectify this omission on every copy of Report received.

Yours very sincerely,
C. M. MASON, C.E.C.

THE CATHOLIC CEMETERY SCHOOL MANAGERS AND THE
St. Mary's Drogheda,
St. MARY'S, DROGHEDA,
April 12th, 1909.

MR. DEAR SIR,—I have just seen what purports to be an authentic report of a statement made by Dr. Starke, Resident Commissioner of the Board of National Education, to a deputation representing teachers that waited upon him at the Education Office on the 6th February last.

In that report I read :—

"Dr. Starke stated that the managers were opposed to the granting of civil rights, and mentioned that they had strong representation on the Board. He held out no hope, because the opposition is too strong in the quarters already indicated to the granting of civil and political freedom to the Irish National teachers."

If the managers to whom Dr. Starke referred are the Catholic clerical managers, as they seem to be, I beg as the Honorary Secretary of their Association, to draw attention to a resolution on the subject unanimously adopted on the 18th June, 1907, by its General Council and duly published at the time :—

"That, being convinced that the first condition for the development and progress of Primary Education is the possession of an efficient and contented body of teachers, we see no prospect of this being secured until the question of salary, pension, and promotion are placed on a satisfactory basis, and until the unreasonable restrictions of the civil rights of teachers are removed."

I am, my dear Sir,
Truly yours,
JOHN CURRY, P.P.

July 19th, 1909.

(CIVIL RIGHTS FOR TEACHERS.

To the Editor of the *Freeman's Journal*.

DEAR SIR,—The Pension question is one that the teachers regard as the most pressing at present. But there must necessarily be some little delay in pressing this question at present, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer has promised to look fully into the matter; and until his reply, after having done so, is given the teachers cannot well agitate this matter before the public. The question of Civil Rights for teachers is the means to an end; and the pressing of this question is not the relegating of the pension question to a back place. Most of the Teachers' Associations meet on Saturday, and they would do well to deluge Mr. Birrell with resolutions reminding him of his oft-repeated promise to see to it that the teachers were granted their civil rights. There are those who believe that the National Board is an independent body, responsible to nobody. This is not the case. Mr. Birrell has admitted that he is complete master of the Board, and that he is as much responsible for the Rules and Regulations of the Commissioners of National Education as the Government for the time being is responsible for the action of the Treasury. It would be well also that each Association would ask its local M.P. to support at the opportune time this claim for Civil Rights for the teachers. If the Irish M.P.'s take advantage of the forms of the House, they can compel Mr. Birrell to fulfil his promise. And I believe every Irish M.P., with the single exception of Mr. Maurice Healy, of Cork, has expressed himself in

favour of this concession to the teachers. I believe I may go further and say that outside the Education Office there is not in Ireland at the present time one advocate of the continued slavery of the National teachers, except Mr. M. Healy, M.P.

I am sure it will be asked why the National Board, as a body, wants to keep the teachers enslaved. What are the Commissioners of National Education more than other Irishmen? The reason for their action is plain. It is the system, and not the men, which is responsible for this slavery of the teachers. According to the system, the one essential qualification for the position of Commissioner of National Education is that he must know absolutely nothing about the business he asks to be appointed to administer. The consequence is that there is blundering and inefficiency in the Education Office. The teachers resent and expose this blundering and inefficiency, which so much retards their usefulness in their schools. And it is only human nature on the part of the Commissioners to make resentment and exposure. The National Board, as a body, is therefore hostile to the teachers; and the members know full well that when the teachers are free to take part in the public life of the country the better opportunity they will have for exposing the inefficiency of the Board, and the more welcome membership of the Board will become. So the teachers may take it that their civil rights will not be granted by the good-will of the Board. It is now something better than three months since Father Curry, of Drogheda, made public in the columns of the *Freeman*—the exact date is 18th April last—that the Resident Commissioner, Dr. Starke, stated to a deputation that waited on him that it was the representatives of the managers on the Board who were opposed to granting civil rights to the teachers. Proof has been given, but especially within these three months, that the managers of at least three-fourths of the schools of the country are strongly in favour of granting civil rights to the teachers. As the managers representatives on the Board have not denied the impeachment, we must take it, until the contrary is proved, that it is they who stand between the teachers and their civil rights, even though they do so against the will of those whom they represent. It is to Mr. Birrell, then, the teachers have to look to compel the granting of their civil rights. Since Mr. Birrell became Chief Secretary this is the one unqualified promise he made to any body of Irishmen that he failed to fulfil. And if the teachers of Ireland put a little pressure on their M.P.'s to put a little pressure on Mr. Birrell, they may, I think, rest assured that this promise will also be fulfilled by him.

Yours, etc.,

P. DOWNEY,
Chairman, Tipperary Teachers'
Association.

July 19th, 1909.

The Interview with Dr. Starke.

To the Editor of the *Freeman's Journal*.

Office of National Education,
Marlborough Street, Dublin.
12th July, 1909.

DEAR SIR,—In a letter which appears in the *Freeman's Journal* of this date, the following passage occurs :—

"It is now something better than three months since Father Curry, of Drogheda, made public in the columns of the *Freeman*—the exact date is 18th April last—that the Resident Commissioner, Dr. Starke, stated to a deputation that waited on him that it was the representatives of the managers on the Board who were opposed to granting civil rights to the teachers."

The Resident Commissioner desires me to give an emphatic contradiction to this representation of what he said to the deputation. It would appear that Father Curry adopted as his authority for the quotation in his letter of 18th April, 1909, the garbled report of a confidential interview, which was most unwarrantably published without being submitted to Dr. Starke.

—Yours faithfully,

M. A. PHILLAN.

September, 1900.

Mr. Callinan asked the Chief Secretary whether his attention has been called to the report of the deputation of teachers who waited on the Resident Commissioner of National Education in connection, amongst other questions, with that of their civil rights, when Dr. Starke stated that the Chief Secretary did the teachers more harm than good over the civil rights question, as he set up the backs of the members of the National Board on the question; whether the members of the National Board and managers are opposed to granting civil rights to teachers; and whether he is prepared to take the necessary steps to have the Irish National teachers permitted to share in the privileges enjoyed by their fellow citizens?

Mr. Birrell.—My attention has been called to the report referred to, and I have also seen a letter from the Resident Commissioner denying its authenticity. I am informed that the question of the civil rights of teachers was considered by the Commissioners of National Education on several occasions in 1906 and 1907, when the restrictions imposed on teachers were relaxed to a considerable extent. The Commissioners do not think that it would be in the interests of the teachers or the schools to modify still further the rules on the subject. The responsibility in this matter rests entirely with the Commissioners, and I do not propose to take action with regard to it.

July 22nd, 1900.

THE INTERVIEW WITH DR. STARKE.

To the Editor of the *Freeman's Journal*.

Dear Sir,—In the *Freeman* of the 20th inst. Mr. M. A. Phelan writes:—"It would appear that Father Curry adopted as his authority for the quotation in his letter of the 12th April, 1900, the garbled report of a confidential interview, which was most unwarrantably published without being submitted to Dr. Starke."

I think this requires a little explanation from me. It has been the practice for many years for the Resident Commissioner to receive a deputation from the Executive Committee of the Teachers' Organisation. Such deputations were received by the late Sir P. Neenan and by the late Mr. Redington, as well as by Dr. Starke. Reports of such interviews were furnished to members of the Teachers' Organisations, but were marked "Private and Confidential." For myself, I have written much in the teachers' class journals in opposition to these private interviews. I pointed out the absurdity of having a document, the contents of which were to be disclosed to eight or nine thousand persons, marked "Private and Confidential." In one case where such a report got into the papers before, there was an "emphatic contradiction," as in the present case. And I gave other reasons why I regarded these private interviews as objectionable. The last deputation to Dr. Starke consisted of three members of the Executive Committee, and Mr. John Murphy, M.P., the date being 8th February last. At a subsequent meeting of the Executive Committee a report of the deputation which was drafted by one of the deputationists was ordered to be printed and circulated, in accordance with the usual custom, among the Associated Teachers, its accuracy being unquestioned by the other three deputationists. I cannot, of course, account for the reason why there is an emphatic contradiction now, though more than three months have elapsed since Father Curry published this extract from the report. I am afraid it is too late to publish contradictions now. Besides that Father Curry published that extract the absurdity of the "Private and Confidential" nature of a document, the contents of which were communicated to some nine thousand persons, was too patent. The result is that the references in the document to the managers and their representatives on the Board are known to thousands of persons outside the ranks of the teachers. And both within and without the ranks of the teachers much bitterness against some members of the Board has been engendered. Injustice may have been done to some of these members. I now see only one way to undo this injustice, and that way is to publish the names of the members of the Board who were opposed and also the names of those who have supported, the granting of civil rights to the teachers. For this course

there have been precedents. The result of the decision of the Board on 10th 1876 was published, and also, some years ago, at the time that the present Lord Morley was Chief Secretary for Ireland, the decision on the resolution of admitting the Christian Brothers to the National system was published.

Perhaps I may be wrong in saying there is only one way to remove this bitterness. There may be a second—a re-consideration of the question and the amending, unanimously or by a majority of the Board, of those who have to educate the children of the masses, who all regard themselves as either freemen or "people rightly struggling to be free."—Yours, etc.,

P. DOHERTY.

Chairman Tipperary Teachers' Association.

21st July, 1900.

July 23rd, 1900.

LETTER FROM THE WRITER OF THE IMPROVED REPORT.

THE INTERVIEW WITH DR. STARKE.

To the Editor of the *Freeman's Journal*.

Carrig, Bury, 21st July, 1900.

SIR,—The statement made in Mr. Phelan's reply to Mr. Doherty in your issue of the 20th July is, strictly speaking, a matter for the whole Central Committee, which adopted and published the report alluded to, rather than for me individually. But as this Committee will not meet for some time, I wish, as the writer of the report, to say a few words in my own justification. I did my best to produce a detailed verbatim report of the interview as faithfully and accurately as I possibly could in the absence of a knowledge of shorthand and taking into account the fact that Dr. Starke is the chief of the department under which I work in my capacity of teacher, it is but natural to suppose that I should take particular pains to be as courteous and diplomatic as possible, while at the same time striving to adhere firmly to the truth. I had also the assistance of a verbal report made on the same day to a sub-committee, and the further help of the memory of the sub-committee afterwards with regard to this verbal report.

With the fact of the report being published without being submitted to Dr. Starke I have nothing to do. The Central Secretary had been for many years accustomed to all manner of deputations, and it is to be expected that he followed the customary procedure in such cases. I am unable to say what that procedure is till the next general meeting of the Central Committee.

Turning aside from Mr. Phelan's and Mr. Doherty's letters to the vexed question with which they deal, viz., the attitude of managers towards the teachers in their agitation for civil rights, I should like to remind your readers that there are other managers besides the Catholic managers. The Catholic managers, numbering 1,448, have, through their representatives, unequivocally demanded civil rights for the National Teachers.

But what of the 1,614 managers of other denominations? How have they supported our claims? At the Presbyterian Assembly in June the question was shelved. As far as I am aware, I think the Protestant managers, as a body, have up to the present remained silent on the subject. And why on earth these Presbyterian and Protestant clergymen should for a moment countenance these absurd and humiliating and unnecessary limitations on the freedom of others which they would not endure for a moment on themselves passes comprehension. If they persist in this attitude I greatly fear that the consequences will be more than they calculate upon.

A word on the managerial question, which has been dragged of late into our agitation not by the teachers, but by others. I say, and I say it advisedly, and I am as sure of it as anyone can be without being a prophet, that the Catholic Teachers will always remain as steadfast in their loyalty to the Catholic Managers in the future as they have been in the past. The Catholic Clerical Managers, as a rule, stand between the teacher and the official, whereas laymen, as

the contrary, would be wholly in the hands of the officials, as we can see in many instances on the existing public Boards. Again, if the Catholic Clerical Managers acts unjustly, there is an appeal to the Bishop. In the case of a lay manager there is no satisfactory appeal. I know teachers who have had experience of both, and I have heard them emphatically declare that they would rather work under the greatest croak (if such existed) of a Catholic Clerical Manager than under any layman. I was present at the Catholic Teachers' meeting at the Congress of 1908, where a resolution was unanimously passed affirming our confidence in the Maynooth Resolutions.

I have general and particular knowledge, as far as anyone can have it, that this is the feeling of the general body of the Catholic teachers, and that these statements of mine are in no way exaggerated.—I am, sir, yours faithfully,

CORRIGAN M. MASON

C.E.C., Irish National Teachers' Organisation.

July 31st, 1910.

THE NATIONAL BOARD.

To the Editor of the *Freeman's Journal*.

DEAR SIR,—The Executive Committee of the Teachers' Organisation meet to-morrow (Saturday), and one of the matters they will have to consider is the letter of the Resident Commissioner's Private Secretary, which appeared in the *Freeman's Journal* of the 19th inst. This letter gives an "emphatic contradiction" to a statement contained in the report of a deputation to Dr. Starke. This one extract from a lengthy report was the only one published; so the teachers are left in doubt as to what portion of the report Dr. Starke would admit to be accurate. There are many members of the organisation who are opposed to sending these "private deputations" to members of the National Board, as they regard them as harmful to the interests of the teachers as a body. The last report of the Executive Committee, which recommended the discontinuance of these "private deputations," was adopted by the Galway Congress. So there are many teachers through the country who expect that the Executive Committee will at to-morrow definitely decide to end these deputations to members of the Board, unless such interviews are open to the representatives of the Press.

Another matter that the Executive Committee must consider themselves about for some time to come is the claim put forward at the Technical Congress recently held in Galway that pupils from the National schools, when they enter Technical schools, are very often too backward to take advantage of the education afforded there. There are some well-meaning persons who claim that the education given in this country under the National system is equal, if not superior, to that given under corresponding systems in other countries. No matter what the education given under the National system is at present, there is much room for improvement. There are surely some well-educated young persons turned out from the National schools, who are successful in the Civil and commercial services. This shows only the possibilities of the system; but the claim put forward by technical instructors that many of the ex-pupils of the National schools are backward is but too well founded. Ireland is rapidly becoming an industrial country, and if successful industrialism is to continue it is necessary that the bulk of the pupils, when leaving the National schools, should have got a good sound literary education, that will fit them to take advantage of the technical education that is now being brought to their doors. The teachers know how the National system may be improved, and at Galway Congress last April they committed themselves to the claim for such a change in the Charter constituting the National Board as shall make that body effective. The National Board, so long as it is constituted under the nomination system that so far obtains, must necessarily be inefficient. To effect a re-organisation of the Board will require a strong public agitation; and very likely before the Executive Committee hold their next meeting after Saturday's, the opportune time to start this agitation through public meetings, and through the medium of the Press that is read by the general

public, will arise. It is not the function of the Executive Committee to initiate, but it is their function to formulate plans for carrying into execution the expressed desires of the Organisation as a whole. So the teachers of Ireland look to their Executive to to-morrow formulate plans for a wide agitation during the autumn—an agitation that will have for the first plank in its platform the re-organisation of the National Board on an elective principle.—Yours, etc.,

P. DONOVAN,

Chairman, Tipperary Teachers' Organisation.

July 30, '10.

August 7th, 1910.

MEETING OF THE CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

SECRETARY'S REPORT.

A meeting of the Central Executive was held at 17 Fleet Street, on Saturday, 31st July, the President, Mr. James MacGowan, in the chair. All the members except Mr. J. M. Thomson, Belfast, were present. The following resolutions were unanimously adopted on the motion of Mr. D. Elliott, ex-President, seconded by Mr. Mansfield, Vice-President:—

(1)—"That as the accuracy of the printed report of a deputation from this Committee to Dr. Starke in December last has been publicly discussed in the *Freeman's Journal*, and as the particular portion of this report which is questioned is the following: 'Dr. Starke stated the managers were opposed to the granting of civil rights,' we now desire to state that the deputationists were unanimous in reporting this statement, and we adhere to our opinion that the printed report is an accurate representation of what occurred at the interview in December last."

August 12th, 1910.

NATIONAL TEACHERS' CIVIL RIGHTS.

THE DEPUTATION TO DR. STARKE.

To the Editor of the *Freeman's Journal*.

Cork, 10th August, 1910.

DEAR SIR,—At the last meeting of the Central Executive Committee of our Organisation, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:—

"That as the accuracy of a printed report of a deputation from this Committee to Dr. Starke in December last has been publicly discussed in the *Freeman's Journal*, and as the particular portion of this report which is questioned is the following: 'Dr. Starke stated the managers were opposed to the granting of civil rights,' we now desire to state that the deputationists were unanimous in reporting this statement, and we adhere to our opinion that the report is an accurate representation of what occurred at the interview in December last."

As I am one of the four who formed the deputation and am not at present on the Committee, I shall thank you to allow me to say that I did not report that Dr. Starke made the above statement. Neither did Mr. John Murphy, M.P., who also was on the deputation. Dr. Starke did say that "some" managers were opposed to the granting of civil rights, but he did not state that the managers as a whole were, which the quotation in the resolution implies. Had he done so, no such statement would be allowed to pass unchanged by me, who raised the question, as I well knew that whilst President of the National Teachers' Organisation, the Central Council of the Catholic Clerical Managers' Association passed a resolution asking for civil rights for the teachers.

I may add that Mr. John Murphy, M.P., acted as secretary to the deputation, and therefore had every reason to be correct in the written report of the interview which he furnished to the Committee, and in that report he does not represent Dr. Starke as making any such statement as that contained in the resolution.—Yours faithfully,

P. GARDNER, N.T.

August 18th, 1909.

NATIONAL TEACHERS' CIVIL RIGHTS.

THE DEPUTATION TO DR. STARKIE.

LETTER FROM WRITER OF IMPROVED IRELAND.

To the Editor of the *Freeman's Journal*.

IRISH SUNDAY SCHOOL,

DINGLE, August 18th, 1909.

DEAR SIR,—I do not purpose continuing this controversy further, but there are two statements in Mr. Gamble's letter of August 12th which I consider it due to me to correct. Mr. Gamble quotes Dr. Starkie as saying that "some" managers were opposed to the granting of civil rights. I took notes; Mr. Gamble took none. I wrote my report immediately after the deputation from my notes. Mr. Gamble speaks from memory alone, after an interval of six months. If Dr. Starkie used the word "some," or any other qualifying word, I should have put it in my report, as I should be as anxious as Mr. Gamble seems to be, not from any selfish or personal motive, but simply as a matter of honour, to represent Dr. Starkie in as favourable a light as strict conscientious adherence to truth would allow. Again, Mr. Gamble says Mr. Murphy, M.P., in the report he furnished, did not represent Dr. Starkie as making any such statement as that contained in my report; but perhaps Mr. Gamble may not be aware that Mr. Murphy's report purports only to be a general account of the interview, and in a general account many things are necessarily omitted which will appear in a detailed report. The Central Committee preferred a detailed report in justice to the members of the Organisation, in order to give them full knowledge of everything that happened for their future guidance in their agitation; hence my report was adopted. I am not any way concerned over the result of this controversy, as I am perfectly convinced that I have been absolutely correct in my report, and shall not trouble your readers further with a report which, in view of the admissions of Mr. Gamble in his last letter, has narrowed down into a personal dispute as to whether the adjective "some" was or was not used by Dr. Starkie.

I am, Sir,

Yours very faithfully,

CATHERINE M. MAHON.

C.E.C. Irish National Teachers' Organisation.

NATIONAL TEACHERS' CIVIL RIGHTS.

THE DEPUTATION TO DR. STARKIE.

To the Editor of the *Freeman's Journal*.

SIR,—Although I read every issue of the *Freeman*, in some mysterious way I missed Mr. Gamble's letter on the 12th inst., and only saw a copy of it to-day. It is rather late for Mr. Gamble now to attempt to give a different version of the interview. The report, as printed, was read over very carefully in the presence of Mr. Gamble, and he knew then he was responsible for the accuracy of it. Not only so, but he strongly objected to another part, and at my earnest request the writer consented to suppress it. I took this course, as I did not wish anything in the report which was not the unanimous representation of those who were concerned. This action of Mr. Gamble's shows he was aware of his responsibility, and was alert when the report was presented. He now says that Dr. Starkie stated that managers as a whole, as implied in the quotation in dispute, were opposed to granting civil rights, "so such statement would be allowed to pass unchallenged by me who raised the question, as I well knew . . . the Central Council of the Catholic Clerical Managers' Association passed a resolution in favour of civil rights for teachers." Why was not Mr. Gamble as vigilant in securing the literal accuracy of so important a report as he says he would have been in correcting Dr. Starkie? A man who was prepared to correct the Resident Commissioner surely would not have permitted an incorrect report to be sent to the Association? As chairman of the

meeting at which the report was adopted, I gave ample time for discussion, and an objection was raised to the accuracy of the portion on civil rights by any member of the deputation.

Yours faithfully,

D. EMMETT,

Ex-President I.N.T.O.

Bloomfield, 26th August, 1909.

II.

1st Letter.

Copy.

June 18th, 1910.

SIR,—A Joint Committee of Arbitration, consisting of two representatives from the Coiste Gnotha, two representatives from the Central Committee of the I.N.T.O., with Professor Eoin McNeill, Vice-President Gaelic League, presiding, met in 25 Rutland Square on Saturday, 18th July, to adjust the differences between the Gaelic League and the National Teachers' Organisation. As a result of this meeting, the Committee formed itself into a joint deputation, representing the Gaelic League and the I.N.T.O., to the Education Office, primarily on behalf of Miss Shanahan, Principal Teacher, Mullinahone G. N. S., Ring, and also with regard to the appointment of a competent Bilingual Teacher in Mullinahone, to advance the interests of Bilingual teaching in that district, without injury to the existing teacher.

As Secretary to the Joint Committee, the duty devolved on me of asking you to receive this deputation, and to appoint the time at which you will kindly do so.

If it were convenient to you to receive it on a Saturday, so that the teachers on it would not have to absent themselves from their schools on a week-day, we should be very thankful to you.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

C. M. MAHON.

Dr. Starkie.

1st Reply.

OFFICE OF NATIONAL EDUCATION,

June, 20th, 1910.

MADAM,—In reply to your letter of 18th inst., I am requested by the Resident Commissioner to say that, before consenting to receive the deputation about which you write, he will require to be furnished with the names of the persons who are to take part in it.

I am, Madam,

Yours truly

A. N. BONAPARTE WEST.

Miss C. M. Mahon.

2nd Letter.

Copy.

SIR,—In reply to yours of this morning, requiring to be furnished with the names of the deputations who wish to wait on you with respect to the case of Miss Shanahan, of Mullinahone N.S., and the appointment of a competent Bilingual Assistant in Mullinahone, I beg to inform you that the deputation consists of the five members of the Arbitration Committee, viz., Professor Eoin McNeill, President, two Representatives of the I.N.T.O., Miss Mahon, Carrig, and Mr. McGowan, Drogheda, two Representatives of the Coiste Gnotha, Mr. McSwiney, Aughrim, and Mr. P. Ward, Glenties, Co. Sligo.

If you receive the deputation, the teachers' members, while prepared to abide by your pleasure with regard to the day and hour which will suit you, will be grateful at the same time if you find it convenient to appoint a Saturday for it.

I am,

Your obedient servant,

C. M. MAHON.

Dr. Starkie.

1st Reply.

OFFICE OF NATIONAL EDUCATION,

June 22nd, 1910.

MADAM,—I am requested by the Resident Commissioner to inform you that he is not adverse to receiving, as proposed, a joint deputation of the Gaelic League and the National Teachers' Organisation with reference to the case of Miss Storkson, of Mullinahone National School. Having regard, however, to certain incidents that followed his reception of a deputation of National Teachers early last year, he is not prepared to receive any deputation at present of which you might happen to be a member.

I am, Madam,

Yours truly,

A. N. BONAVENTE WYSE.

Miss C. M. Mahon,
Carrig N.S.

2nd Letter.

Copy.

SIR,—I received your letter to-day re reception of the joint deputation of the Gaelic League and the I.N.T.O.

In consequence of your objection to myself as a member of it, the Committee withdrew my name from the Organisation side and Mr. Ward's from the Gaelic League side, and request you to receive the deputation of three members, viz., Professor McNeill, Mr. McGowan, and Mr. McSweeney.

Kindly say on what day and hour you would receive them. Next Saturday would now be too soon, as I would not have time to communicate your arrangements to them, but perhaps next Saturday would suit you.

I am,

Your obedient servant,

C. M. MAHON.

Dr. Starke.

3rd Reply.

OFFICE OF NATIONAL EDUCATION,

June 22nd, 1910.

MADAM,—I am requested by the Resident Commissioner to say that he can see the joint deputation, now consisting of the three gentlemen mentioned in your letter of 22nd inst., at 12 noon on Saturday next, the 26th prox.

Will you be so good as to convey this information to the members of the deputation?

Yours faithfully,

A. N. BONAVENTE WYSE.

Miss C. M. Mahon.

SIR,—On Sunday last I received your letter stating that you will receive the joint deputation, consisting of Messrs. McNeill, McGowan and McSweeney, on Saturday, 2nd July, at 12 noon. I have written to each of them to-day, asking them to meet together in Tyne House a few minutes before 12 o'clock.

I thank you for your kindness in receiving the deputation, and for your consideration in making the arrangements to suit the teacher members of it.

With regard to your objections to myself and the case of same, I shall, with your permission (which I shall take for granted unless you specially forbid me) write out and send you a copy of my own vindication of myself in the matter.

Again thanking you on behalf of the Arbitration Committee, which I hope has laid the foundations of a new era of mutual assistance and good-will between two Organisations which have so much in common.

I am,

Your obedient servant.

C. M. MAHON.

Dr. Starke.

III.

MEETING OF THE CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

A special meeting of the Central Committee of the Irish National Teachers' Organisation—convened by the President and myself—was held on the 8th November at 35 Rutland Square, North, Mr. Edm. Mansfield presided. The other members present were:—The Vice-President, Ex-President, Treasurer, Miss Mahon, Miss Larmoy, and Messrs. McSweeney, Nash, Cunningham, Feenighty, Joyce, O'Connell, Ramsey, Thomson, Numan, and McGill.

The first and special business considered was the Deputations. The previous meeting was, per excellence, a meeting for deputations, no less than four being appointed, of which two were to the Resident Commissioner. One exclusively from the Executive "with respect to the new mathematical programmes and the percentage necessary to obtain fees; also with respect to the present position of the Housing and Cleaning Question, Cooking and Laundry, Tenure of Assistant, Monthly Salaries." A second in respect of the case of the Undergraded Teachers, consisting of Messrs. O'Callaghan and Cunningham of the C.E.C., and a special representative selected by themselves from the deputation of Undergraded Teachers which conferred with the Executive Committee on the 8th ult. On the motion of Mr. Ramsey, seconded by Mr. McGill, the first deputation was to consist of the President, Miss Mahon, Mr. Thomson, and Mr. McGill. I duly forwarded a copy of the resolution to Dr. Starke, with the request that he would kindly receive the deputation and name a convenient date which I suggested, might with advantage be before the National Education Estimates were forwarded to the Treasury for the forthcoming year. To my letter I received the following reply:—

"Office of National Education,

" Marlboro' St., Dublin,

" October 17th, 1910.

" DEAR SIR,—The Resident Commissioner desires me to inform you in reply to your letter of the 15th inst. that he will be willing to receive a deputation regarding the matters you mentioned to consist of the following members only, viz.: Messrs. Mansfield, J. M. Thomson, and J. T. McGill.

" As the Resident Commissioner will be absent from Dublin on Saturday next it will be convenient for him to receive the deputation on the following Saturday, 29th inst., at 12 o'clock.—I am, dear Sir, yours faithfully,

" A. N. BONAVENTE WYSE.

" Mr. M. Doyle,

" Central Secretary,

" Irish National Teachers' Organisation."

Shortly after the receipt of this letter I communicated the fact of her exclusion to Miss Mahon and the President, and asked of the latter what was to be done. On the 24th October I got the following telegram from the President:—"Doyle, Ballymore. Miss Mahon urges going in against. Let you wire prepaid each member asking opinion. Communicate result deputationists—Mansfield." The only rational interpretation I could give to this was that Miss Mahon desired to act on the deputation against the wishes of the Resident Commissioner, and accordingly I sent the following wire to all the members of the Committee who have the power of voting (Organisation Rule 15):—"Miss Mahon desires act compulsorily on Starke deputation send your opinion immediately—Doyle." In the course of the afternoon the following replies were received:—"Let her stay at home—Thomson"; "Deputation should not go to Starke without her—O'Callaghan"; "Mahon not to go deputation proceed without her—Ramsey"; "No deputationist can be forced on any person—Larmoy"; "Deputation should not go without her—McSweeney"; "Against deputation proceeding—Nash"; "Deputation should not proceed without Miss Mahon—O'Connell"; "If refused how go compulsorily—Cunningham"; "Unless full deputation received none should proceed—Feenighty and Numan"; "Let Miss Mahon stay at home—McGill"; "Cannot agree with her going compulsorily, would probably exclude all future deputations—Joyce"; "Send deputation to Starke without me—Mahon." This latter telegram

was received on the 25th October, and then it was manifest that the President's first telegram to me was misunderstood, and that the mistake was probably made by the Post Office officials in transmitting or receiving the message. On the evening of the 25th the following telegram was received by me:—"You misunderstood my wire yesterday morning, Mahon urged that others go without, I wired all to-day seven wired for deputation seven others and my vote against, am writing, with—Marshall." After this, and not wishing the deputation to fall through, I made the following appeal to Dr. Starke:—

"Ballymote N.S.,

"26/10/1910.

"Sir,—In reference to the proposed deputation from the Central Executive Committee of the National Teachers' Organisation, which you kindly agreed to receive at 12 o'clock on next Saturday, the Committee observes with extreme regret that Miss Mahon has been excluded from the deputation. On all the subjects intended to be put before you for discussion and consideration she is—with, perhaps, the exception of the President—by far the best and most widely informed of the deputations, and, therefore, the Committee thinks her absence on next Saturday would be a serious drawback to the utility and thoroughness of the conference with you. I have, therefore, very respectfully to request that—with the delicate and charitable consideration which you must feel for her sex, and the liberality and broadmindedness which characterised your official acts on many previous occasions—you will be kindly pleased to reconsider this matter.

"Should your objection be to the unnecessarily large number deputed on the occasion, then the Committee earnestly requests that one of the Belfast teachers (Messrs. Thomson and McGill) should be left out and Miss Mahon be retained on what the great body of the National teachers look forward to as one of the most important deputations which ever had the honour of waiting upon you.—I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

"M. DOYLE,

"Gen. Secy., I.N.T.O.

"W. J. M. Starke, Esq., M.A., LL.D.,

"Res. Com. of National Education."

To this came the following reply:—

"National Education Office,

"Marlboro' St., Dublin,

"27th October, 1910.

"Dear Sir,—I am requested by the Resident Commissioner to say in reply to your letter of yesterday's date that he regrets that he is not prepared to receive Miss Mahon as one of the members of the deputation arranged for Saturday next, and that for reasons which were indicated to Miss Mahon in a letter sent to her by direction of the Resident Commissioner on the 27th June last.—I am, dear Sir, yours faithfully,

"A. N. BONAPARTE WYSE.

"Mr. M. Doyle.

"P.S.—In case you wish that the interview arranged for Saturday should be postponed you will much oblige by letting me know before 6 p.m. to-morrow (Friday).—A. N. B. W."

The P.S. looked conciliatory, and evidently left the matter open for further negotiation, and after consulting the President I telegraphed to Mr. Bonaparte Wyse on Friday to put off the reception of the proposed deputation till after our meeting on the 12th November. I felt, however, that, after the arrangement arrived at on the 8th October with Messrs. Quicke, Tierney, Devlin, and Galvin, there would be grave dissatisfaction among the Undergraded teachers if their deputation was postponed or jeopardised; and acting under serious responsibility I telegraphed the President to anticipate our usual meeting by a week, and agree with me to hold a special meeting on the 4th inst. to consider fully the deputation crisis. He

promptly concurred, and the meeting was accordingly convened. I next despatched the following letter to the Resident Commissioner:—

"Ballymote N.S., Co. Sligo,

"2nd November, 1910.

"Sir,—On the part of the Executive Committee of the National Teachers' Organisation I beg leave to state that at its meeting on the 8th October there was a second deputation nominated to wait upon you in respect to the pressing and long-standing question of the treatment of the Undergraded teachers—a question which concerns a very considerable number of our body. I beg to enclose a carefully-prepared statement of those affected since the sweeping and radical changes made in the system by the National Board in 1900, a copy of which, I believe, was forwarded early this week to all the Commissioners by Mr. Quicke, of Ballinagarry N.S., Kildenny.

"A deputation consisting of Messrs. George O'Callaghan and Jas. Cunningham, of the G.R.C., and of Mr. Quicke, specially representing the Undergraded teachers, was appointed to wait upon you at an early date in reference to the neglected claims of this numerous body of National teachers. As regards the other deputation, certain members of which you only consented to receive on Saturday last, the Executive Committee were obviously placed in a somewhat delicate and awkward position. For the cogent reasons urged in my letter of the 26th October we were most anxious that Miss Mahon should act on that deputation, but you thought proper to decline to receive her. Scattered as the members of the Executive Committee are over all the provinces, obviously it was impossible to make other arrangements without a meeting of our Committee. The President and myself, therefore, have convened a special meeting for Saturday to consider those urgent matters.

"We are fully aware of your very responsible duties and engagements in connection with the administration of National Education in this country; but we earnestly hope you will kindly arrange to meet both deputations on next Saturday (or Monday), so as to have the views of the teachers fully and clearly put before you on the subjects named.—I have the honour to remain, Sir, your very obedient servant,

"M. DOYLE,

"Gen. Secy., I.N.T.O.

"W. J. M. Starke, Esq., M.A., LL.D.,

"Res. Com. of Natl. Education."

Subjoined is the answer received:—

"Office of National Education,

"Marlboro' St., Dublin,

"November 8th, 1910.

"Dear Sir,—The Resident Commissioner asks me to say, in reply to your letter of the 2nd inst., that he has no objection to receive a deputation regarding the question of the Undergraded teachers, as well as the other deputation which was the subject of our previous correspondence, so long as his wishes regarding the names of the deputations are complied with. For reasons which were set forth in a letter which I addressed to Miss Mahon on the 31st ult., he cannot consent to receive any of the teachers (with one exception) who were members of the deputation that waited on him in February of last year, and this decision of his prevents him receiving Mr. George O'Callaghan, who is mentioned as one of the proposed deputation on the question of the 'Undergraded' teachers.

"If your Committee will arrange to select members for the two deputations who were not at the interview of February, 1909, the Resident Commissioner will be able to receive either or both deputations at an early date. I fear there is not now sufficient time to complete the arrangements by Saturday next.

"If it will expedite matters in any way I shall be happy to see you here, as suggested, at any time after 10.30 on Saturday morning.—I am, dear Sir, yours faithfully,

"A. N. BONAPARTE WYSE

"M. Doyle, Esq."

The foregoing letters and telegrams, with some others unnecessary to publish, were submitted to the meeting and debated and criticised at considerable length. Finally it was decided to publish the correspondence for the information of the teachers; together with Miss Mahon's vindictory letter to Dr. Starke and his reply through Mr. Bonaparte Wyse.

1. The following resolution was proposed by Mr. Thomson, seconded by Mr. McGill:—"That a deputation from the C.E.C. be appointed to wait upon Dr. Starke with respect to Heating and Cleaning, Civil Rights, Mathematics, Tenure of Assistant, Deductions from Salaries of Deputationalists, and Monthly Salaries." To this an amendment was proposed by Mr. Nash, seconded by Mr. McGowan:—"That no deputation to Dr. Starke proceed from the C.E.C. while he refuses to receive certain members of this body." For this there voted—Messrs. O'Callaghan, Nash, McGowan, Numan, Feughly, Cunningham, O'Connell, and Miss Mahon. Against—Messrs. McGowan, Thomson, McGill, Ramsey, Joyce, and Miss Lormont. This amendment on being put as a substantive resolution was carried by 8 to 0—the members voting as before. It is thus the deputation question stands at present.

MISS MAHON'S VINDICATION TO DR. STARKE.

Canig, Birn

20th October, 1910.

SIR,—On the 22nd June last I received a letter from you in reply to mine, stating that "having regard, however, to certain incidents that followed your acceptance of a deputation of National Teachers early last year, you were not prepared at present to receive any deputation of which I might happen to be a member."

In my reply, withdrawing my name, I wrote as follows:—"With regard to your objection to myself and names of same, I shall, with your permission (which I shall take for granted unless you specially forbid me) write out and send you a copy of my own vindication of myself to the matter."

At the last meeting of our Central Committee, October 9th, I was again appointed on a deputation to interview you on matters affecting the teachers' interests. The Central Secretary submitted to you the four names of the deputationalists—three gentlemen and one lady. In your reply to him you consented to receive the three gentlemen, but again eliminated my name.

As there is now no doubt but that you are labouring under a misconception with regard to me, I avail myself of this opportunity of placing before you the true history of the incidents you allude to as responsible for your reluctance to allow me over to see you again.

"STATEMENT."

(a) A deputation, consisting of three teachers and one M.P., waited on Dr. Starke on 6th February, 1909.

(b) I acted as secretary, and, as far as I possibly could, took a verbatim report of the proceedings.

(c) My report was read at the following Central Committee meeting. It was adopted by the C.E.C., and ordered to be published as a "Private and Confidential Report."

(d) The report contained a statement of the Resident Commissioner's on the question of "Civil Rights for Teachers."

(e) A copy of the report fell into the hands of a clergyman, secretary to the Catholic Clerical Managers' Association.

(f) This Revd. secretary published in the *Free Press* of April 13th, 1909, a contradiction of the Resident Commissioner's statement as far as the managers of his denomination were concerned, and in support of his contradiction, he quoted a resolution of his central council, passed in 1907, demanding that "the irreconcilable restrictions on the liberty of teachers be removed."

(g) Nothing further transpired till July 18th, 1909, on which date a teacher (in *Free Press*'s Journal) misquoted, inadvertently, no doubt, the Revd. secretary's quotation.

(h) On July 20th, 1909, Mr. Phelan, private secretary, denied (in *Free Press*'s Journal) this misquotation.

(i) On July 22nd, 1909, I published a letter in the *Free Press*'s Journal, standing up for myself, showing that I did my best to report the truth without fear or favour.

(j) On July 31st, 1909, the C.E.C., at their meeting, unanimously passed a resolution affirming their belief in the accuracy of the report, "especially," their resolution states, "as the deputationalists at the time were consistent in reporting the statement in dispute."

(k) On the 12th August, Mr. Gamble, one of the deputationalists, but since retired from the C.E.C., wrote a letter to the *Free Press*'s Journal, commenting on the C.E.C. resolution, and half-dragging, half-affirming the statement on "Civil Rights."

(l) On the 16th August I wrote, my final letter on the subject, pointing out how Mr. Gamble's letter vindicated me, and again affirming my own conviction of the correctness of my report.

(m) On August 23rd Mr. Elliott wrote a letter to the *Free Press*'s Journal, which wound up the dispute. In this letter he exposed Mr. Gamble's tactics, and supported me from the remembrance of the facts stated to him as President at the time. That the statement in the report became public in the *Free Press*'s Journal is a matter for which I cannot be held responsible.

But when it did become the subject of public controversy I had no alternative but to defend myself. My reputation for veracity is as dear to me as the King's is to him, and in fact more so, if that were possible, because I have to earn my bread in a position in which my character has to be irreproachable for every three months, my reputation undiminished, and in which I am specially enjoined by role of the Commissioners to "inculcate the principles of truth and honesty." Apart from rule, this is Christian duty.

With regard to the report being printed and circulated without being first submitted to Dr. Starke, that had hitherto been always the usual procedure with such reports. No report of any previous deputation was ever so submitted; why should this particular one?

For instance, in the report of a deputation which waited on Dr. Starke in 1907, some reference was made to managers in another connection.

That report fell into the hands of some Western managers, and the Commercial Managers' Association subsequently passed a condemnatory resolution, yet Dr. Starke did not then, or at any subsequent time, express any wish to see reports before publication, and it cannot be consistently charged against the C.E.C. or myself that the report was "unwarrantably published" without Dr. Starke's consent.

Even since, other deputations waited on Dr. Starke, and they were not requested by him to submit copy of their report, neither did they, till Mr. McGowan, to avoid a repetition of the unpleasantness which I experienced, voluntarily and spontaneously submitted an advance copy of the report. Amendments were made in this advance copy, and Mr. McGowan had to go back on another deputation to get these amendments eliminated.

SIR,—These are the plain, simple facts of the case. I do not seek to intrude on you personally socially or professionally. But, as you are head of the primary system in Ireland, I, as the elected representative of the teachers who work under that system, claim the right to put the views of my constituents before the chief administrator whenever I am chosen to do so. My own personal opinion as to the value, or otherwise, of such deputations have nothing whatever to do with the matter. When chosen, it is my duty to act to the best of my ability. In this matter I have acted perfectly straight, honourable, and above-board, from beginning to end, and, since I was first elected by the teachers to work for their advancement, I have tried to fulfil the trust reposed in me without one selfish thought, or one selfish desire of gaining favour for myself or the shoulders of my constituents, and I hope to continue so to the end. What I earn by honest industry in my school I desire—no more.

I am confident that time will vindicate me, if I can only wait with patience.

THE DEPUTATION QUESTION.

But it is not every day that a Joan of Arc is born, who can walk unflinchingly in the sacred cause of Freedom and her fellow-man, looking beyond the border for her reward, and awaiting the verdict of posterity for her justification.

Thanking you for giving me this opportunity of placing my vindication before you,

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

CARMELO M. MAHON.

Lady Representative, C.E.C., I.N.T.O.

W. J. M. Storkie, Esq., Litt.D.

DR. STARKIE'S REPLY TO MISS MAHON.

Office of National Education,

Dublin, 31st October, 1910.

MADAM,—I am requested by the Resident Commissioner to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 26th inst., containing a statement in justification of your action in connection with the deputation of representatives of the National Teachers' Association that was received by the Resident Commissioner on 6th February, 1909, and I am to remind you that it was distinctly understood that the proceedings at the interview were of a confidential nature, and that, were any report of them issued, it should consist merely of a brief summary of the subjects that were discussed.

In spite of this understanding you furnished, from memory, a full report of the interview to the Central Committee of the Teachers' Organisation, which was afterwards issued broadcast to the members of the Association, and to others throughout the country. It would appear that the report when issued was not even marked "Confidential" as a letter over your signature was printed in the Irish School Weekly, on the 3rd April, 1909, stating that the words "Private and Confidential" had been inadvertently omitted from the top of the report, and requesting the recipient (or such of them as might happen to come across this belated correction) to insert these words on the document.

It is not surprising, in such circumstances, that a letter quoting portions of this supposed confidential report was published in the *Freeman's Journal* of April 18th, nor that the *Irish Nation* of the following Saturday was able to present long extracts of this "private" document to its readers.

It is obvious that in view of what was agreed on at the interview, it was a gross breach of good faith to issue such a report unless with the Resident Commissioner's sanction, and in doing so you violated the understanding in virtue of which the Resident Commissioner consented to discuss the subjects raised by the deputation.

Moreover, besides that no opportunity was afforded to the Resident Commissioner of revising or correcting what, though written from memory, professed to be a verbatim report of statements made by him to the deputation, when he drew attention to the inaccuracy of certain extracts of this report appearing in the Press, you treated his letter with great discourtesy by refusing to accept the correction and persisting in declaring the published report to be accurate.

So far from affording any excuse for your action, your present letter merely attempts to justify it, and the Resident Commissioner must adhere to his intention to refuse to receive in deputation you or any of the other teachers who approached him on the 6th February, 1909, with the exception of Mr. Gamble, who publicly dissociated himself from the action of his colleagues.

I am, Madam,

Yours faithfully,

A. N. BOMPARDT WYER.

Miss C. M. Mahon.

Carraig N.S.,

Dire, Dec. 3rd, 1910.

DEAR MR. BOMPARDT.—When the correspondence between the Resident Commissioner and myself was published by the order of the C.E.C. in the Irish School Weekly, of November 12th, I earnestly hoped that the matter was at an end, and that I would be spared the pain of pursuing it any further. But alas! for my hopes. Unpleasant questions began to be asked here and there about points in the Resident Commissioner's reply to me, and when even in the correspondence in the Weekly the matter had actually begun to be made capital of for discrediting purposes, and for another very obvious motive, I saw that it was inevitable that I should furnish an explanation.

I accordingly wrote the enclosed letter, as courteous and clear an explanation as was possible, of the points raised by the Resident Commissioner, in the hope that a further reply from him would clear up all matters of doubt and distrust in the eyes of the teachers. I have not yet got any reply, but if I do I shall gladly send it to you for publication.

Yours very faithfully,

C. M. MAHON.

MISS MAHON'S REPLY TO DR. STARKIE.

Carraig, Dire,

November 12th, 1910.

SIR,—I am extremely loth to pursue this correspondence any further. But in your reply of 31st October, 1910, to my letter of vindication of 26th October, 1910, there is one point which, for the sake of the good name of past and present Central Executive Committees of the Teachers' Organisation, I must of necessity draw your attention to.

In your reply to me you say "that it was distinctly understood . . . that were any report to be issued it should consist merely of a brief summary of the subjects that were discussed." Now, till I got this reply of 31st October I never heard of any such understanding being entered into. I never heard of any understanding that admitted the possibility of publishing no report, or at best, only a brief summary.

I certainly would not act on any deputation on behalf of the entire body of teachers under condition of such an understanding. No member of the present C.E.C. has a knowledge of such an understanding as far as I could ascertain.

The late Dr. Clarke, who arranged for the deputation, was the soul of honour.

He never instructed us that he had agreed on our behalf that we should publish only a summary, and he was present at the C.E.C. meeting on 27th February, 1909, at which my full report was adopted in preference to a summary submitted the same day by a non-teacher.

If any deputation ever entered into such an understanding with or without the connivance of the then existing C.E.C., to suppress the whole truth and put the Organisation off with a brief summary, such action would elicit the strongest disapproval of the members of the Organisation, and, if such ever happened, it is but fair to make known the particulars.

You mention that I "furnished a full report to the C.E.C. and the members of the Associations."

I regard such action on my part as a subject of merit, not offence, from the associated teachers.

The associated teachers elect us to represent them, per our expenses on such deputations, and, considering that the interests of over 8,000 teachers are at stake, and those interests varying and in danger of conflicting if not well watched, as in the case of rural and city teachers, teachers of large and small schools, etc., the associated teachers are entitled to a full report of what transpires on these deputations.

By thus knowing exactly how their rights were safeguarded, their interests forwarded, and by knowing the exact attitude of the administrator on the different phases of their case presented to him, they will be able to judge for themselves of their prospects of redress or advancement on the different questions discussed, and to shape their future agitation accordingly.

I did not write from memory only. I took notes. You probably did not notice me, you were so far away from me at the opposite side of the big round table, but I had my book on the table writing all the time.

I quite understood that such deputations are always, or have hitherto always, been "Confidential," and with regard to the treatment of the words "Private and Confidential," it was inadvertent.

When I got a copy of the Report from Dr. Clarke and noticed the comment, I at once wrote to Dr. Clarke. He was much distressed about it. He wrote at once to all the secretaries asking them to insert these words on the copies received, and he marked all that lay in his hands. "Private and Confidential" is not ink. I also wrote the note in the Weekly to the same effect.

To the action of the member who publicly dissociated himself from his colleagues, I have the utmost reluctance to refer. Fortunately for me, and for the C.N.T., a sub-committee was sitting that day in Fleet Street, preparing the Congress Programme. We made a formal report to this sub-committee, and its members must remember the acquiescence by words and attitude of Mr. Gaskell that day in that portion of the report afterwards disputed.

The whole C.N.T. remember the same acquiescence on the 25th February, when the deputation report was adopted, as was shown by Sir John President, Mr. Elliott, in his letter of 25th August. That Mr. Gaskell afterwards changed front probably is a matter I do not wish to comment upon. The deflection of a representative on a matter in which the self-respect of the whole Organisation is at stake is very painful, and all of us would much rather allow the cloak of charitable silence to cover us all.

I shall not trouble you again with any further correspondence (unless with you expressed wish), but you are understood that it was due from me to the C.E.C. and to the associated teachers to forward you this explanation of the points raised in your reply; and, as this correspondence has to be published, I shall be thankful for reply.

Your obedient servant.

CATHERINE M. MARON.

W. J. M. Sharkey, Esq., J.B.D.

Craig N.S.

Bttr, 6th December, 1910

Sir,—Since posting my letter to you I have received enclosed reply from Dr. Sharkey. In connection with it I can only reiterate and emphasise everything I have already stated in my two letters.

Yours very faithfully,

CATHERINE M. MARON.

Dr. Sharkey's second letter to Miss Mahon:—

Office of National Education,

Dublin, 6th December, 1910.

MADAM,—I am desired by the Resident Commissioner to say, in reply to your letter which he received on the 31st ultimo, that he has no desire to enter into further discussion concerning the deputation of February, 1909. He wishes, however, to remind the Central Committee of the Teachers' Organisation, that in Mr. Phelan's letter (July 14th, 1908) to their Secretary he laid down, in the following terms, the conditions on which he was willing to receive deputations:—"Before Dr. Starke consents to receive this deputation he will require to have an assurance that the proceedings at the interview will be regarded as confidential, as experience shows him that observations made in the course of past interviews have been disclosed, and that even erroneous accounts of what took place have been published. The Resident Commissioner further wishes to remind you that, on the occasion of the deputation of February 6th, 1909, he spent a considerable time in explaining what he meant by 'confidential,' and his reason for requesting that interviews with him should be treated as such. He pointed out that the uncontrolled interchange of ideas was the chief value of interviews between the teachers and the head of the administration, and that this would become impossible if, as on many recent

occasions, isolated expressions of his were published, possibly in a garbled form, and certainly without the careful qualifications which, though out of place in conversations, are indispensable in a statement intended for publication.

The Resident Commissioner was asked by a member of the deputation, who, to the best of his belief, was yourself, whether he objected to a report of the proceedings for the purposes of the Organisation, and he replied that anything of the nature of a detailed confidential report was out of the question, as experience had shown that, in the absence of shorthand writers, verbal accuracy was unattainable, and that the confidential nature could not possibly be preserved if communicated to some thousands of teachers; but that he would consent to a general report of the proceedings being circulated. Though the Resident Commissioner thought that in this promise and in his earlier correspondence with Dr. Clarke, he had made his position quite clear, he furthermore throughout the interview repeatedly and earnestly impressed on the deputationists the confidential character of many of the remarks which were subsequently published in a garbled form by the Organisation. In view of these circumstances, the Resident Commissioner cannot but feel that "the good name," if not of the Central Committee, at any rate of the deputationists, is gravely affected by their having sanctioned the preparation of a "verbatim report" of the interview, which he had expressly forbidden, and by having circulated it broadcast, without taking any precautions that its confidential character should be preserved. The Resident Commissioner regrets the decision which has been forced upon him by this violation of a definite understanding. He has always welcomed opportunities of discussing with the representatives of the teachers the defects of Primary education; but he is convinced that such discussions lose their chief value when not conducted with the perfect freedom and candour which are the natural outcome of mutual confidence and good faith.

Yours faithfully,

A. N. BENNETT WYSE.

Head of Deputation Correspondence.

Appointment of Philip Ward in response to Teachers' Organisation.

During this year Mr. Birrell, in response to the request of the Irish National Teachers' Organisation, appointed Mr. Ward as Teacher Commissioner on the Board of National Education. In addition to other influences the teachers' deputation waited on Mr. Birrell on 4th July, 1910, and Mr. Ward's appointment was made public in September.

One man can do little on the Board as at present constituted, with one woman he might do a little more, as two could second each other's resolutions and put them in order for discussion, but discussion is of little value while the Minutes of 1902 remains, and even with its abolition while Dr. Starke dominates the administration.

If recognition of principle that Teachers ought to be represented on Education Board.

Yet by Mr. Ward's appointment the teachers won recognition of the principle that they ought to have direct representation on the Education Board; they had been agitating for that recognition since 1897, and perhaps before it—that is 16 years.

Mr. Ward won some minor concessions.

Though Mr. Ward could not effect anything in the way of reform, yet he won some little minor concessions since his appointment.

In 1911 the Character Query requiring managers to certify to the teacher's character every three months, and the confidential report asking the managers to return on the teachers every year, has disappeared.

One resolution on this year's minutes indicates the spirit of the Board, or rather of the Office, towards the Organisation:—

27th August, 1910.

Decking of Salaries of Deputationists.

5. "That as the officials in the Education Office have withheld payment of salary from members of

the C.E.C. of the I.N.T. Organisation, when said members were doing most important deputation work on behalf of Irish Elementary Education, and as payment under similar circumstances was made without demur until a very recent date, we respectfully call upon the Commissioners and their officials to reconsider the decision to withhold payment from any teacher who may be selected to present the views of the Organisation to His Majesty's Officers, charged with public administrative functions, or any other business connected with the work of the Organisation. That as the Treasury recognises 200 school days as sufficient to obtain full payment of salary for a year, we fail to see any cause why the Commissioners should be more oppressive and exacting than the Treasury officials. That as the Commissioners of National Education make grievous complaint in their annual reports, that due and proper attention is not given by Government and Treasury officials to claims and suggested improvements made by them from time to time in connection with Irish Primary Education, their sincerity would be more apparent if they did not withhold salary from deputationists who, on the rare occasions which occur, endeavour to support their demands and in very large measure urge for the same improvements. That copies of this be sent to the Commissioners officially and individually as soon as possible." T. J. Numan, G. O'Callaghan.

Mr. Redmond's description of it.

Shortly afterwards a deputation of teachers which waited on Mr. Redmond put this hostile procedure of the Board in docking the salaries of deputationists before him. Mr. Redmond characterised it as "unthinkable littleness."

PRIMARY EDUCATION.

Deputations to Mr. JOHN REDMOND.

At the October meeting of the Rathfriland Teachers' Association, Messrs. Minnis, Kelly, and MacSweeney, C.E.C., were appointed as a deputation to wait on Mr. Redmond to thank him and the Nationalist party for the exertions on behalf of primary education in Ireland during the past year, and also to request him to use his influence with the Government to induce them to give early effect to their recent promises on the pension question, tenure of assistant teachers, etc.

At the last moment Mr. Kelly found it impossible to attend, and his place was taken by Mr. Edmund Power, Secretary of the Co. Wicklow Teachers' Association.

Mr. MacSweeney introduced the deputation. He said they came chiefly to thank Mr. Redmond, and through him the Irish Party, for the assistance they had given the teachers during the past year. The appointment of Mr. Ward as a Commissioner of National Education was due largely to their exertions and influence, and the success of the recent deputations from the C.E.C. to Mr. Birrell and to Mr. Lloyd George was owing, to a great extent, to the goodwill of the party to the cause of primary education, and to the influence they were able to bring to bear on the Government. Part of their business, however, was to point out to Mr. Redmond the urgent need of giving early effect to the promises made by the Chief Secretary and by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to the C.E.C. deputations.

Mr. Minnis then explained the pressing need for an improved pension scheme.

Mr. Redmond said he thought he knew all the deficiencies of the present pension scheme, and so did the Ministers of the Crown chiefly concerned; they had been well schooled on the question. He would say at once that the Government was entirely favourable to the teachers' claim for a very much improved pension scheme. Owing to the great increase in the revenue receipts the Chancellor was now in a far better position to give effect to his promise than he was when that promise was made to the teachers' representatives. Mr. Lloyd George was determined to bring in the improved pension scheme as he had promised, and the Irish party would keep the question well to the front.

Mr. Power dealt with the question of civil rights. He pointed out certain ways by which he thought the

Commissioners could be brought to accede to the wishes of the teachers, and the often-expressed demands of the nation for this important concession.

Mr. Redmond said their great difficulty lay in the fact that the Commissioners were responsible to neither people nor Parliament. The proposed remedies looked all right in theory, but would not work out so well in practice. This and other important reforms could be easily obtained if they had a Department of Education under a Minister responsible to the Irish people; but it was not advisable to set up a Department of Education in Ireland responsible to the people of Great Britain.

Mr. Power—Might I ask, Mr. Redmond, are you in favour of civil rights for teachers?

Mr. Redmond—Most certainly; I, and every member of the Irish Party.

The question of assistants' tenure was then gone into by Mr. MacSweeney. He explained that an average of 50 qualified a school for the services of one assistant, 40 for two, and so on at the rate of an assistant for each additional 40 in average attendance. He pointed out that there may be a saving of anything up to 40 over the necessary average without a compensating advantage to the school or to the assistant; but on a fall of half a unit below the required average, the school lost the services of the assistant, and the assistant lost his salary. The teachers claim that, once an assistant is appointed in a school, a saving of ten below the qualifying average should be allowed. Mr. Birrell had declared in favour of this, and the Commissioners had lately shown an inclination to concede the point.

Mr. Redmond said he was aware that Mr. Birrell was anxious to see this reform granted, and if the Commissioners could be got to agree to it, the Treasury would not block the way. He took special note of the matter, and said that he would have an interview with Mr. Birrell in the course of the next fortnight, when he would bring it under his notice.

Mr. Redmond then asked about the heating and cleaning of schools. It was a question in which he was deeply interested, as it affected the comfort and health of the children, and especially of the poor children, at a critical period of their lives. Though the question was not specially dealt with by the deputation, he would not forget it when the proper time came. Praising the work done by the recent deputations from the C.E.C. to Mr. Birrell and to Mr. Lloyd George, he said so much had not been done for the cause of primary education in Ireland for many a long day.

Arising out of this, it was pointed out that the Commissioners had refused to pay salary to the deputationists for the days they were absent in London engaged on this most important educational business, a business which the Commissioners themselves should have undertaken, but which they did not, either from apathy or from a consciousness of inability to bring it to a successful issue.

Mr. Redmond expressed the greatest astonishment at what he called the unthinkable littleness of such a proceeding. He was glad it had been mentioned to him, and thought it should get the fullest publicity.

The deputation then withdrew.

Salary Docking not a Treasury Regulation.

That it is not a Treasury requirement is shown by the erratic nature of the salary docking, e.g., my salary was not docked for going as delegate on Lady Aberdeen's invitation to W.N.E.A.; my salary was docked for going to Mr. Redmond to Dolphin's Barn discussion; Mr. Mansfield's salary was always docked; Mr. Thomson's salary was never docked, even when the two on the same deputation, and so on.

These are not merely the doings of the financial accountant without higher orders.

YEAR 1911.

Rule 92 (f).

During this year the Commissioners scouted notions in the exercise of their Rule-making powers when they devised Rule 92 (f), more generally known as the Maternity Rule. About an hour before the close of the Banger Congress at Easter, 1911, someone brought in an Independent and handed it up to the President, containing the following bombshell:—

Its Prosecution.

NOTICE TO MANAGERS OF NATIONAL SCHOOLS.

Managers of National Schools are hereby informed that married women teachers will be required during the period preceding and succeeding child-birth to absent themselves from their schools for three months, and to provide qualified substitutes (at their own expense) for any portion of their absence not included in the ordinary vacation of the school. This regulation becomes operative immediately, and will apply to all cases of child-birth occurring after the 30th June, 1911.

By Order of the Board,

F. E. LEMASS,

W. J. DUNWOODY,

Secretaries.

Office of National Education,
Dublin, April, 1911.

Bangor Congress Resolution.

Immediately after the adoption of the Report on Audit and Organisation the Standing Orders were suspended, and on the motion of the President, seconded by the ex-President, a resolution strongly condemning the recent harsh and intemperate rule promulgated by the National Board, in reference to the treatment of married women, was carried by acclamation, and a copy of same ordered to be telegraphed at once to the National Education Office.

This resolution, no doubt, after it had got the usual "Belfast consideration of the Commissioners," was contemptuously ignored by them, and the row began, which only died down in November, 1912.

Exceptional Harshness and Inequality of this Rule.

This rule was exceptionally cruel and harsh. The most inexplicable thing about it was that it deprived a teacher mother of the month's leave of absence allowed by the Treasury in case of illness.

Rule 92 (8) says:—"In cases of prolonged illness one month's leave of absence is allowed, without stoppage of salary, on the production of a doctor's certificate." Rule 92 (9) deliberately nullifies this by introducing an opening phrase:—"Notwithstanding anything contained in the preceding portions of this rule, married women are required to absent themselves from their schools . . . and to provide substitutes at their own expense, etc."

If the Commissioners had made a rule that, in addition to the ordinary month's leave allowed by the rules, married ladies should absent themselves for twelve months, it would be harsh enough, but to sweep away from the married lady the month allowed by rule, and to fine her a quarter of her salary and emoluments for every birth, was the climax of cruelty, and was a voluntary not on the part of the Commissioners. The Treasury could devise nothing so harsh, arbitrary and illegal as this rule.

Deputation to Mr. Birrell.

A deputation waited on Mr. Birrell in August, 1911. He said he was not consulted by the Commissioners about it, and that having been brought under his notice he would now look into the whole matter.

Brief Historic Sketch of the Belfast and Tipperary Appeals from general point of view of Dr. Starke's action.

During this year also the Belfast and Tipperary teachers appealed to the Board for redress of their inspection grievances. On 6th February, 1911, the Belfast teachers presented their appeal by deputation to Dr. Starke. In both cases the chiefs were sent to investigate. In both cases the chiefs sided with the inspectors.

The inspectors were given a copy of the teachers' charges. The teachers were not given a copy of the inspectors' counter-charges. The Belfast teachers managed to see them through a Commissioner who lived in their midst. The Tipperary teachers never saw them till they met their horrified gaze in the first Blue Book of evidence published by this Committee. Yet, on these counter-charges, made behind their backs, their appeals for redress were refused.

The Tipperary Inspector was known to be in very high favour with the Resident Commissioner. Dr. and Mrs. Starke paid a series of hurried visits to the Tipperary schools, and found nothing radically wrong with the making of the highly-favoured official.

On the 2nd June, 1911, the Belfast teachers' appeal was officially refused, and the refusal was accompanied with a lecture on the relations that ought to exist between the inspectors and the teachers. This was supplemented by a circular on tone, as the first word on the subject.

Though the Belfast teachers kept on appealing still, by correspondence till the end of the year 1911, they were invariably referred to the reply of the 2nd June, and at last, on 8th December, 1911, in their last letter to the Board, they protested that "no worse state of affairs for education can be imagined than that of teachers being forced to settle down in sullen and hopeless discontent at being the victims of harshness and injustice."

Effect of Refusal of Appeal on (a) Belfast or (b) Tipperary Teachers.

The Tipperary teachers were not even allowed to present their appeal by deputation. They had to send it by post in June, 1911, and that, of course, precluded all discussion or explanation. After six months of unsatisfactory correspondence the Tipperary teachers in December, 1911, also received formal official refusal of their appeal, and the refusal was accompanied with an insulting lecture on their procedure, and winding up by referring them to the Tone Circular there to learn the relations that should exist between them and the inspectors.

The Tipperary teachers, however, did not contemplate sitting down in sullen and hopeless discontent. They were conscious of great wrongs, and when the ordinary red-tape procedure of the Board failed to concede redress they were driven to more forcible methods.

Dr. Starke's Sensational Disclosures in 1911 Address.

In his Belfast address of June, 1911, Dr. Starke makes some sensational disclosures, which throw light on the treatment of the teachers from 1906 onward. He made some professions there which to the teachers seemed strangely at variance with practice. In that address he makes public for the first time that the policy of the Tory Government was a policy of starvation of Irish Education. He says:—

"Before the new scheme was fairly launched, Mr. Balfour left Ireland, the Beer war had begun, and, with it, the new policy, which is not yet abandoned, of starving Irish education, in order that the local authorities might be constrained to levy a rate for education. The Treasury accepted our proposals with the proviso that they should not cost anything in addition to the existing grants. As the reforms could not be deferred, now that the results' examinations had been abolished, we were compelled to accept their terms. In transferring the teachers from the classes to the grades, it was necessary to consider individual cases of grievances. As the satisfaction of these was very costly, and as no additional money was forthcoming, it may be readily understood that our position was nearly desperate; but in our difficulties we were deserted by the Government, who, as was shown in the sequestration of the Development Grant, had other fish to fry. Instead of giving us the assistance which they had promised, they took advantage of our unpopularity as a means to represent in the House of Commons that, since we were so inefficient, no more money could safely be voted to primary education. Even my Belfast address was utilized in order to secure the appointment of Mr. Dale, with a view, not to help the reformers of Irish education, but to effect reductions, or at any rate to obviate increases, in an already insufficient grant."

Contrast 1911 admissions with 1902 attacks.

At the time that the Treasury did this in 1900 and that the Board was desperate for want of money and was forced to inflict injustice on the teachers with the new Scheme, and to break Archbishop Walsh's pledge to the teachers, Dr. Starke could have avoided all this

unpleasantness by confiding in the teachers and joining with them in the demand for the increased funds. If he did the money would have been granted, for he would have had the whole Irish nation with him in the demand.

But instead he went to Belfast in 1902 and made a most offensive attack on the Teachers' Organisation for daring to complain instead of being grateful for their "privileges," "privileges" which, as it now transpires, did not exist only in his theories.

What is the good of disclosing in 1911 the cause of wrongs done in 1902? What confidence can be placed in a man who takes nine years to admit the truth, and then only in view of the approaching dissolution of his Board.

Difference between platform platitudes and official practice in dealing with teachers—e.g., 1911 address.

In his Belfast address, July, 1911, Dr. Starke delivered the following beautiful platitude:—

"The old system was objectionable because it made slaves of the teachers and inspectors. I have recently been told that they are still slaves. If so, they are largely themselves, both teachers and inspectors, to blame. Freedom of teaching organisation, and inspection is the watchword of the Board. Without mindless and self-respect a teacher's influence is taught with his pupils; and the Board is determined to support any measure calculated to raise the status of the teaching profession, which hitherto has not received a tithe of the honour and respect due to those to whose hands the destinies of the rising generation are committed for better or for worse."

And then he went back to the office and fostered this "mindless and self-respect" by refusing both the Belfast and Tipperary appeals, making the teachers feel that as far as the Board was concerned they were slaves without rights of men, crushing down the Belfast teachers into sullen and hopeless discontent, and irritating the Tipperary teachers into feelings of revolt.

YEAR 1912.

Deputation received by Board 26th July, 1912.

During this year the repeated requests of the Organisation for 13 years prevailed at last, and on the 9th July, 1912, the Commissioners consented to receive a deputation from the Teachers' Organisation for the first time in their long and checkered history. Previously, in October, 1911, and January, 1912, they had asked managers and teachers to send delegates to confer with them on the subjects of higher grade schools and scholarships.

Dr. Starke's opinion of Mansfield at Conference.

The Teachers' Organisation sent Mr. Mansfield to look after the teachers' interests on both occasions, and Mr. Ward afterwards told us that Dr. Starke was particularly impressed with Mr. Mansfield's great intellectual abilities. In the light of recent events I mention this.

Deputation Pension Sub-Committee to Board, 4th August.

On the 6th August, 1912, the Pension Sub-Committee, of which I am a member, made an attempt to get a few minutes interview with the Board, and failed. In our negotiations with the Treasury over our pension scheme the Treasury consented to extend the retiring age for women to 65 where necessary to qualify for full pension, provided the Board did not object. The matter was very urgent as the salaries were waiting for instructions, so Mr. Mansfield and I went up to the Board meeting on the 6th August, 1912. We met Mr. Ward in the forenoon and sent him up with our request to Dr. Starke. Mr. Ward came back very disappointed, and told us we had better write our request, as Dr. Starke was unapproachable with any message from us. So we wrote up our request to the Board and waited. The members of the Board began to turn in from 8.30 to 4 o'clock. Mr. Wyse came down and said the agenda was too heavy to allow the Board to see us—Mr. Mansfield's name was on it that

day for trial. Mr. Wyse took up our message and after an interval, owing to a misunderstanding of my explanation to him, he brought back an unsatisfactory reply. We asked him to go again, but he demurred, he did not like to interrupt the Board meeting again.

Dr. Foley's Influence.

In desperation I wrote a note secretly and sent it up into the Boardroom to Dr. Foley by the hall-porter. In a trice he came down, took up our message, turned back some of the members who were leaving, got the resolution passed and a copy given to us. But only he was there, and friendly to me personally, our five hours' weary waiting at the doors of Tyrone House begging for a five minutes' interview would have been in vain. The President and Vice-President of the Teachers' Organisation were treated at Tyrone House like beggars seeking alms for themselves, instead of like advocates championing the interests of the members of a great Organisation.

Mr. Ward's Influence.

Mr. Wyse was, personally, most courteous and agreeable, but, of course, he could do nothing. Neither could Mr. Ward. He was repelled that day just like any of the officials who are now under the present regime dispirited by the unnecessarily humiliating term "subordinate."

Contrast of Dr. Starke's Attitude with other Departments.

In striking contrast to the attitude of Dr. Starke towards our Organisation is the attitude of all other administrators to whom we have had to turn. We see received by the Vice-Chief, Chief Secretary, Under Secretary, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and by all the officials connected with their respective offices with the utmost courtesy, kindness, and respect, and in cases of urgency without any formality or red-tape whatever, and their correspondence is marked by the absence of casuistry or equivocation, and strikes a distinctly human note in marked contrast to the cold, repellent formality of the Education Office.

Dr. Starke in Cork, 1912—Dr. Starke's breach of discipline.

On the 5th June, 1912, Dr. Starke, at the Technical Congress, made a political speech, in which he attacked the financial classes of the Government of Ireland Bill before Parliament. In doing so he admitted, actually proclaimed, that he was breaking the law, breaking through the discipline of the Civil Service, of which he is a member. This was the first time he ever raised his voice in public on behalf of the finances of education, and he evidently loomed so largely on his own horizon that he assumed he was the first and only one who had ever done so. He said—"Having been for the last 13 years more intimately associated than almost any other Irishman with the finances of all grades of education, he conceived it his duty not to deprive his fellow-countrymen of any help he could give in the present crisis."

Offensiveness to Teachers.

This was peculiarly offensive to the teachers, knowing as they did that for those 13 years the Teachers' Organisation had agitated in season and out of season for increased finances for education, interviewing Ministers, holding meetings sending deputations to Westminster, and doing all with no help, but much hindrance and hostility, from Dr. Starke's Board, and remembering also that though the equivalent grant, which was afterwards lost, was six months' tramping in the balance—from March to September—when Dr. Starke made his 1902 speech there, instead of mentioning one word about it, he made a case for its sequestration, by representing the managers and people as indifferent to education—an argument on which Mr. Wyndham afterwards based his sequestration of the grant and its diversion to other purposes.

Faith to Organisation.

And then the taunt, "The time has come for one who knows to be outspoken on a question on which the majority—to judge by their silence—are either ignorant or afraid to speak," seemed specially levelled at the teachers.

The teachers were never either ignorant or afraid to speak for the 12 years he was silent on this question, and now when it suited him for some reason to come out he thought to drag the teachers after him into the misadventure of "party politics," which they are directly prohibited by his Board from touching.

Mr. Mansfield's perversity expressed in Censor.

Mr. Mansfield saw through all this, and in Censor (18th July, 1912), at a teacher's meeting, he pointed out the contrast between Dr. Starke's professions and practice, showed that while he was making demands for thousands in public, in private he was upholding the inspectors, who were depriving their poor slave-driven sons of the miserable little increment of £7 earned by their consecutive years' drudgery in their schools.

Mr. Mansfield's Dismissal.

On the 15th October, 1912, Mr. Mansfield was most callously dismissed, his punishment being out of all proportion with his alleged offence. Dr. Polcy, who is a very strict disciplinarian, and who was absent on that day, expressed his opinion that a reprimand would have met the case. On the 19th October the Teachers' Executive met and cut off communication with the Board henceforth till Mr. Mansfield is reinstated. On the 31st October, 1912, Mr. Birrell refused in the House of Commons to grant an inquiry into the Mansfield dismissal, the first time that Mr. Birrell ever failed in, but he was rushed into giving his decision while he had only seen the Commissioners' version of the case.

Afterwards, on the 5th November, he granted an inquiry into the whole system, including Mr. Mansfield's dismissal.

MR. MANSFIELD'S SPEECH.

These are the extracts complained of. The first was in the summarised version:—

"The Commissioners, too, who fined and degraded teachers for their efforts were apparently most anxious to make heroic bids for popularity, and while they sent back tons of thousands each year of unexpended balances saved through the severity and tyranny of their officials, were now making public attacks on their fellow-conspirators at White-hall."

The following, under the heading "Senior Inspector," were marked in red:—

"Mr. Mansfield referred to the Senior Inspector of the Censor, Mr. Welpy, and said it was also lately necessary in the interests of education itself to have him removed to another circuit. Certainly the teachers who had come into contact with him during the last two years, and who had been exasperated and annoyed by him could not put forth their best efforts while he remained. Sometimes, when there was an unruly boy, a wise father shipped him away to some place where, in new surroundings, he might turn over a new leaf, and become a good boy."

[This extract he was in a later letter asked to repudiate publicly.]

"But he (Mr. Mansfield) believed that the Commissioners themselves were really responsible for this kind of thing. There was no doubt about it. Dr. Starke made fine speeches in Belfast and Cork and elsewhere—glorious speeches they were, perfect models of eloquence and reason, and perhaps patriotism sometimes. But it was hard to reconcile Dr. Starke's views with the action of his petted and pampered officials. The very men who were slave-driving in the schools were the pampered pets of the office, and it was ridiculous for Dr. Starke to go down to Cork and make an attack on the Treasury. He had wanted by the way, until the question of Home Rule came on, but during past years, while the teachers had been fighting and struggling, a miserable couple of shillings had been taken off his (Mr. Mansfield's) salary because he was doing the work the Commissioners themselves should have been doing. They kept back his promotion one year because he attended on a deputation to Mr. Redmond to get the grant of £21,000

per annum for the heating and cleaning of schools. During all the years that the teachers had been fighting and struggling Dr. Starke never moved hand or foot, but now he came along on the eve of Home Rule and made an attack on his former conspirators at the Treasury. Fine speeches were all very well for public consumption, but they who knew the real state of affairs knew very well that Dr. Starke was responsible for inciting this man, Mr. Welpy, to run counter forthwith, to his own orders. Personally, he (Mr. Mansfield) believed that we could not be worse under Home Rule. He believed on the contrary that things should improve—certainly they could not be worse than under the present Board—and there could not be more waste of money on the things that did not matter."

Truth of Mr. Mansfield's speech proved.

Every word Mr. Mansfield uttered on the 15th July in Censor was true, and has since been abundantly proved to be true by the evidence before this Committee. Yet it took the dismissal of Mr. Mansfield, the revolt of the teachers, the appointment of a Committee of Inquiry, and six months laborious, honorary work by that Committee before Dr. Starke could be got to admit that the Tipperary teachers had a grievance, or to promise to look into that grievance, though he knew it before as well as after such a gigantic and far-reaching revolution. What chance had teachers of any ordinary every-day fair play under an administration that will move only under such pressure?

Reaction of Board when Inquiry over.

Is there not reason to apprehend that when this Committee dissolves, Antipopeus will repent of his repentance and Pharos will recall the liberty he so unwillingly gave the children of the oppressed, and that the screw will be put on to punish other teachers marked out for the guillotine by their action in this revolt, notwithstanding the guarantee of indemnity given.

Possibility of Board since Inquiry granted.—Maternity Rule—Dismissals—Increments—Re-inspection.

After Mr. Mansfield's dismissal the Commissioners during this year gave way to Mr. Birrell's wishes and withdrew the maternity rule in its first form. Also, Mr. Birrell got the Treasury to give the money for restitution to the mothers who were fined, to the number of some hundreds. Also since the promised appointment of this Committee of Inquiry some assistants have got promotion—some threats of dismissal revoked—some dismissed teachers reinstated—increments and promotions given freely—and actually some cases of re-inspection and re-entrance.

All this could be done while a cannon, in the shape of an inquiry, was pointed at the heads of the Commissioners without Treasury interference, yet for 12 years the blame was always put on the Treasury for the financial wrongs to teachers. This is the manifesto of the Teachers' Organisation cutting all communication with the National Board:—

THE O.E.C. MANIFESTO.

Dismissal of Mr. Mansfield, Vice-President, I.N.T.O.

"We, the members of the Central Executive Committee of the National Teachers' Organisation, in meeting assembled, desire to congratulate Mr. Mansfield on the plucky stand he has made against a system of administration fraught with injustice and wrong.

We call on the Government to reinstate Mr. Mansfield and to immediately grant a full inquiry into the entire administration of the National Board, particularly in regard to the question of inspection and its bearing on the matters of increments, promotions, and dismissals.

We call on the Irish members of Parliament of all shades of opinion to press the Government to grant a full inquiry and to reinstate Mr. Mansfield.

We also call on the Irish Public Bodies and Associations of all classes to help to secure the above demands.

As evidence of the need for a full inquiry, we wish to point out the written statement of Mr. A. Purser, who was chief of inspection under the National Board until last November.

Writing on 8th April, 1912, he says:—

To my mind the greatest grievance the teachers have is that there should be no means of appealing against a matter of the sort, and that the Resident Commissioner or any higher official should be allowed to intercept and stop an appeal addressed to the Board. I, as the highest official, give my opinion that Mr. ——— had been unfairly reported on, and was unable to have the report cancelled or my view of the matter laid before the Board.

And again, on the 23rd October, 1912, he says:—

That the teachers have no means of making an effective appeal in case of an unjust report is perfectly clear and patent after my experience in the ——— case, but I think that you write impudently when you write of smashing the Board, and that your Organisation is attacking the wrong party. It is not the Board that is unwilling to do justice to the teachers, but Dr. Stankie, who suppresses the facts and reports, and thus prevents the Board coming to a proper or any decision.

A. PURSER,
Chief of Inspection.

We pledge ourselves to sustain Mr. Mansfield in his position until he is reinstated, and we refuse, as a Committee, to hold any communication with the National Board until this matter is satisfactorily settled.

We wish to point out that the action of the National Board is a determined attempt on the very existence of the Irish National Teachers' Organisation, and an attempted death-blow at the right of a representative of an organised body of workers to discuss in a reasonable and fair manner the administration of the Board under which they give service.

We also desire to point out that the National Board is an unrepresentative body, responsible to no one, neither to the Government which appoints its members, nor to the Irish people who pay, and whose children are educated under the system.¹¹

No system could succeed where such relations existed between Board and teachers—where all means of access to Board were denied at every crisis.

The foregoing is a synopsis of "the relations between the Commissioners and the teachers" for 15 years.

Now, I submit that no system, even the best in the world, could be a success under such relations between the administration and the workers of the department. Each succeeding year was characterised by a fresh violation of vested rights, or a new grievance, and renewed causes for hostility and estrangement.

At every crisis the door was slammed in the faces of the teachers, and they were again and again refused every "means of access to the Board" till the time for redress was past, and then they had to swallow every previous humiliation, and stand humbly back again in the vain hope of still prevailing on one who would not be converted.

Deputation to Dr. Stankie's workhouse.

On the minor and commonplace occasions when Dr. Stankie did admit the teachers to an interview he repeatedly told them that he could do nothing but lay their views before the Board. At that time they did not know he exercised the right of veto on what went before the Board, and knowing now, in the light of recent disclosures, that Dr. Stankie is the Board as well as the Office Committee, the presumption is strong that the views of deputations never went before the Board at all—at all events, not the smallest concession could ever be traced to one of these deputations to Dr. Stankie.

Moral of foregoing and Appeal to Commission.

The heads of the Teachers' Organisation, who should be the pioneers of educational progress, have been incessantly occupied in the leadership of a defensive agitation.

The first essential to progress is freedom for the teachers from the incessant distractions caused by a harsh and hostile administration, freedom to devote their minds to educational research, freedom and encouragement to go ahead and distinguish themselves in scholarship and pedagogy, freedom while under the British constitution to speak and act like free citizens of the Empire—when this is secured, and not till then, will education in Ireland make any progress, or make up for all that has been lost during the strife and misery of the last unhappy cycle of 15 years.

In the name of God and conscience, I appeal to this Committee to make such recommendations as will secure to the teacher this legitimate freedom, and such recommendations for a change in the personnel of the administration as will save any other victim from the vindictive punishment meted out to Mr. Mansfield for daring to criticise a man who arrogates to himself the right of unbridled criticism on everybody and everything.

FURTHER STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE TENDERED ON BEHALF OF THE IRISH NATIONAL TEACHERS' ORGANIZATION.

Part II. of Miss Mahon's statement has been incorporated in evidence.

PART III.

I now come to the concluding portion of the terms of Reference, viz., "whether any, and if so, what changes are desirable in the system of Inspection" and also "whether in any case some notice of the intention to make new rules should be published."

I wish first to record the firm and universal conviction of the teachers that no changes in inspection only, will produce peace, security, and progress, till radical changes are first made at the root of all the evils, viz., in the Administration.

The Board requires to be reformed and the personnel of the administration changed, before any confidence can ever again be reposed in the working of the Education Office. In my Congress Address, I sketched what I thought would be a satisfactory Board. I know this Committee of Inquiry cannot touch the Charter of the Board, but yet I append my Congress suggestions in the hope that some of the methods of procedure I suggested might be recommended in the working of the present Board, pending the greater reform essential to education.

BOARD SKETCHED BY ME IN MY CONGRESS ADDRESS, 1913.

New Board—Its Constitution and Formation.

The constituent parts of this Nation directly interested and experienced in Primary Education are three-fold:—(1) The People; (2) The Managers; (3) The Teachers.

A perfect, popular, an satisfactory Board can be devised thus:—Let (1) The General Council of County Councils, as representing the people; (2) The Managers' Association (Catholic and Protestant), as representing the Managers; (3) The Teachers' Organization, as representing the Teachers, elect five members each. Then, as the State collects and distributes the Educational Finances, let the Cabinet (whether home or Foreign) select five members.

The members elected thus will not necessarily be commission, clergymen, teachers, or Cabinet Ministers, but rather educationists in whom the electors have confidence. Let such a Board be responsible to Parliament (whether English or Irish) and above all let it be elected for a term of (say) 3 or 5 years, preferably 3, at the end of which time there will be a re-election and all unsatisfactory members replaced.

Life Tenure and Secret Procedure

are responsible for all the wrongs of the present system.

Any Board elected for life invariably becomes, firstly, indifferent; secondly, reactionary; thirdly, despotic, and despotism always leads to anarchy.

With the permanent Resident Commissioner there should be a paid Assistant Commissioner, so that one could keep a check on the other, and as the same Resident Commissioner has acquired an unpopular significance, the names might be changed to Director and Assistant Director, the Assistant to have the same voting power as the Director at Board meetings, &c.

These two should not be Civil Servants but public servants with full civil rights, and they should observe the same spirit of give and take in criticism of their acts as all other public servants from Cabinet Ministers downwards.

Procedure of New Board.

This Board should be divided into several Sub-Committees each in charge of a special department, one dealing with Building Grants and General Finance; another with Programmes, School Books, &c.; another with Inspection and Appeals; another with Training and Promotion of Teachers, and so on.

The sub-committees should report the result of

their findings to the full Board, the latter only take action thereon. The meetings of the Board should be either open to the Press, or fully reported in the Press by the Secretary (same as the Teachers' Executive meetings).

No rule or change to be made, except by resolution of the whole Board, the proposer and seconder, with names of those voting for and against, to be given in the published report of the proceedings.

Even then such resolution should be laid before Parliament for a certain time, and should get Parliamentary sanction before it becomes a rule of the Board.

In cases of grave hardship there should be always the right of appeal to Parliament as the supreme controlling authority of such Board.

Co-Ordination.

Even if all the education systems are co-ordinated under one central authority, as they ought, the new National Board which I have endeavoured to sketch should form the Primary Education section of the Central Board. The only difference co-ordination would make would be to lessen the number of members from each of the elective bodies I have enumerated.

Such a Board would realise Popular Control in the truest sense, and whether Home Rule comes or not, I challenge anyone to find a better scheme of reform, that will give satisfaction to all creeds and classes, that will abolish present and prevent future strife, and promote peace and progress in our new nationhood.

Women Representation on Board.

And now I put in a plea for my sex. Half the teachers are women, half the school children are girls.

A proportion of the members of the new Board should be women, and either the Director or Sub-Director should be a woman."

Reform.

Trying to patch up and to improve the present system while the Board remains unreformed, and while the Board and the Office continue to be dominated by the present Resident Commissioner, is only pating a plaster on a cancer. The cancer is there, when cut off in one direction and patched up, it cuts away in another direction, till it finally undermines the whole constitution, and ends in a final and fatal collapse. While the present Resident Commissioner remains, the teachers will live constantly in a state of subdued panic, like the deer in the forest, always on the alert, with ears strained, listening for the rumblings of the newest edict from Tyrone House, expecting victimisation and injury with every move from that institution, and ready to rush together to make still another fight against the severest injustice.

The Belfast teachers are a people whom it takes a great deal of wrong to move to revolt against an existing institution. From the time I first met Dr. Starke, in 1909, I told them where the root of all our evils lay, yet till they had their own experience of him, they could not realise the true state of affairs. Now, this week, I had a memorandum from them suggesting reforms, and in the accompanying letter they say: "Most of us here are opposed to the proposed Divisional Inspectors as a Court of Appeal; they would simply be Dr. Starke's catspaws, like the present seniors. Besides, the idea comes from Dr. Starke, and that is itself enough."

So the first thing that should be done to promote peace and restore confidence is to promote Dr. Starke to some higher sphere. The teachers do not wish or ask for his dismissal; they do not seek to return evil for evil, but they do wish him well in another sphere, for while he remains dominating Education, the teachers' lives will be spent in the future, partly in fear and trembling, and partly in agitation and revolt.

I am sorry to have to say this, and I fear it will appear hard-hearted from a woman in your eyes,

* Since the above Address was delivered the following comment on the suggested scheme of reform has appeared in *The Educational Review* for April, 1913:—"We are not quite sure that the General Council of County Councils would be regarded as a satisfactory constituency unless all the Councils came in, but it would be easy to provide that all the Councils would appoint a Joint Council if only for this purpose of electing representatives on an education Authority."

but as an educationist interested in the progress of my country as well as on behalf of the teachers, I see no other way out.

Then the office of Resident Commissioner should be abolished, and a Director and Sub-Director appointed. These would hold a check over each other. The Office Committee should be re-established and the Chiefs and Secretaries on this Committee—men of ripe experience—would hold a further check on the judgments of the Directors. The Board should be divided into sub-committees, and should look after everything by a division of labour and report to the whole Board for decision on their recommendations as to action; their meetings to be reported in the Press in the manner sketched by me in my Congress Address. It is no excuse for the Commissioners to say they are busy men and have no time for this work. The members of the Teachers' Executive are busy men, and yet they find time to adopt this procedure in looking after the interests of the same number of teachers for which the Commissioners are responsible. Inspectors should be placed each in charge of a district for which he will be responsible, and left there for some time, say seven years or so. Head Inspectors should control a number of districts. There should be frequent Conferences, between inspectors, managers, and teachers, at which the best methods of teaching the various subjects and all other matters pertaining to school keeping would be discussed. *Specimen Time-Tables for every class of school, and showing how every subject could be included so as to be taught effectively* should be issued from the Education Office. These time-tables should be discussed at the Conferences, and the teachers should be encouraged to point out their defects and to suggest improvements, and thus each would have the benefit of the others' wisdom and experience. The representatives of the teachers should at all times have free and friendly access to the Board, and Conferences between the Board, the teachers, inspectors and managers should be frequently held for the enlightenment of the Commissioners and the promotion of a better understanding, the main object being of course the improvement of education.

In the absence of a *Suave Inquire*, a Court of Appeal should be formed for investigating grave charges involving dismissal. This Court might consist of a representative of the manager, teacher, and a Commissioner as chairman. In this investigation a teacher should be allowed every facility according to judicial procedure, viz., a solicitor to defend him, power to examine and cross-examine witnesses; a shorthand writer to take note of the proceedings verbatim. This verbatim report, together with the recommendation of the Court, to be transmitted to the whole Board.*

A case of appeal against an inspector's report, with demand for re-inspection might be decided by the Office Committee (consisting of Director, Sub-Director, Chiefs of Inspection, and Secretaries (5)), but in case their decision is adverse there should be right of appeal to the Sub-Committee of the Board entrusted with the care of appeals. This Sub-Committee should obtain, independently of the Office Committee, all available information from manager and teacher. This can be done by correspondence, then a special Sub-Committee meeting held to consider and arrange it. Finally, the Sub-Committee will place all the information so collected and arranged, together with its recommendation on the appeal before the whole Board for final judgment. Cases of appeal involving dismissal should always be fully examined into, and decided by the whole Board. For investigations or inquiries into grave charges involving penalisation or dismissal, a Court of Appeal should be formed. This Court should consist of three persons, viz.—(1) a representative of the manager; (2) a representative of the teacher, and either a Commissioner or Chief Inspector as chairman (never the local, senior, or other inspector). The teacher should be allowed every facility for defence allowed in ordinary judicial procedure, viz., copy of charges beforehand to enable him to prepare his defence, permission for Counsel to attend and assist in his behalf by examining and cross-examining witnesses, an official shorthand-writer should be present to take

a verbatim report of the proceedings. The Court of Appeal should at the conclusion consider and make a recommendation as regards action on the case, and transmit this recommendation together with the verbatim report of the proceedings to the Commissioners for the final judgment of the whole Board. Investigations into anonymous charges should be forthwith abolished.

Increments should be annual and should accrue automatically for each year of satisfactory service, and be payable without delay on the 1st of the month following the anniversary of the teacher's entry into the service, as is the case under the London Education Board, the maximum salary to be attainable in fifteen years.

A year's satisfactory service means a period of twelve months during which there was no proved neglect of duty, or any grave official offence incurred by the teacher.

In case of an adverse report in any year, the increment should not be stopped in that year, but the teacher should be notified that formal examination will be held at the end of the next annual period, teacher to get a full year of twelve months to remedy defects alleged before stoppage of increment.

In all cases of re-inspection or re-examination where the teacher wins, the bad report should be withdrawn and cancelled both in the school records and the Office records, and the new one substituted.

Promotion should be given partly by efficiency and partly by scholarship as before 1900. The examination might be rather examination in Pedagogy something like what is required for the English "Diploma of Teaching" Degree, rather than a purely literary examination, or there might be alternative courses allowed, e.g., a literary, a mathematical, a pedagogic, etc., so that teachers in backward districts removed from the opportunity of availing themselves of university courses, or other classes might not be handicapped in the race for promotion. Existing teachers should get the option of coming under the new schemes or remaining under the old. Assistants should be allowed promotion to the highest grade on the same conditions as principal teachers, with salary at least to the maximum of 2nd class, as under the old rules.

Reprimands should be abolished, and no teacher should be censured without being given full particulars of the grounds on which the censure is proposed, and full and satisfactory opportunity for explanation and defence.

The Observation Books both of inspectors and Organisers should be abolished, and a verbatim copy (complete) of the inspector's report should be forwarded to both manager and teacher simultaneously. This report should be sent out from the Office within a reasonable time so that in case of appeal, a re-inspection cannot be refused on the ground of the interval of time that has elapsed. Reports should be judged as a whole, so that the report should be considered satisfactory even though one or two unessential subjects might be regarded as weak.

The corporal punishment regulations should also be abolished as they are absurd and impracticable. Writing in the Corporal Punishment Book interrupts and shortens the teacher's lesson, and causes the pupil's attention to be distracted from it. Keeping a child waiting ten minutes for his punishment frightens the child, and takes his attention away from his lesson. A ten minutes' trowal on a lesson, with all the accompanying distractions of the Corporal Punishment Rules, is a serious loss to both teacher and pupils.

Every school should have its own school year, and a year should be given for a year's work. The examination should be held in the last month of the school year. Due notice (say a fortnight to a month) should be given to both manager and teacher. The examination should be a class examination, and might be confined to the principal subjects. For the purpose of this examination, a table should be prepared showing the attendances of pupils, and a minimum number of attendances, say 100, should be necessary to qualify a child for attendance at the examination. The examination should be conducted by the teacher and inspector combined. Inspectors should form an independent judgment without reference to the previous reports.

* See next paragraph for fuller explanation.

Promotions should take place, as a rule, after the examinations, but in the matter of promotions the teachers' judgment should be supreme, and he should be always free to promote a child at any time of the year, or to deny promotion to those mentally, physically, or otherwise unfit.

The merit mark should be abolished and the school reported on as a whole, and a full verbatim copy of the inspector's report should be furnished to the manager and teacher within a reasonable time. Every teacher should have a right of appeal, against an unsatisfactory report, his appeal should be heard and considered by the Board, and a re-examination by a higher official granted.

The feeling of the Teachers' Organisation is very strong in favour of a separate school year for each school. It has been the demand of our Congresses for many years.

It is impossible for an inspector to form a correct estimate of the work done in twelve months by an inspection in the first month or two of the year. Without a fixed school year, examination would fall through, as it is only possible as a test of a fixed period of work.

Teachers should not be held responsible for the state of the premises or grounds, growth of flowers, for sanitation and equipment, &c.

Proposed new rules should not take effect till laid on the table of the House of Commons for the usual statutory period of 40 days. No rule should be retrospective to the injury of existing teachers, and no rule applied to a section should nullify privileges given by another rule to the general body, as in the case of 52(g) which nullifies the privilege given by 52(b).

Before Rules are decided on, Conferences should be held between the managers, teachers, and a reformed Board of Education, where proposed rules would be discussed with the view of affecting an agreement, and thereby avoiding the friction and agitation which has followed the sudden and unexpected promulgation of so many of the present Board's rules in the past. The teachers' representatives should always have full and free access to the Board, and should be invited and permitted to confer with the Commissioners regarding educational matters and changes affecting their interests.

All Rules, not only Rules of the Code, but also all rules of Official administration that relate to the teachers, or affect them in any way, should be published. Teachers should never again be kept in ignorance of the conditions under which they work, as they have been under Mr. Sturges' administration for the last thirteen years. There should be no secret rules as heretofore in the case of merit marks, promotions, reprimands, appeals, &c., by which teachers were secretly judged and either punished or rewarded, in ignorance both of the rule and of the official responsible in the Office. All circulars to inspectors should be issued simultaneously to managers and teachers.

All the old official precedents of the Office should be now wiped out, as most of them were adverse to the teachers, and the administration of a reformed Board should start out of the new, and deal with individual difficulties as they crop up under the new order, and the new rules, without any reference to the old bad precedents of the past.

Tons should be abolished as the chief factor in judging a school, and take a subsidiary place as it did under the old system. The undergraded and transition teachers should have their classification removed, and their financial grievances impartially inquired into and redressed. Standard numbers should be abolished, and the paper-promoted teachers should get the salary of their grade with arrears.

Junior Assistant Masteresses should get a living wage and increments of good service salary. J.A.M.S. appointed under 38(a), 1906-7 Rules, should not be dismissed if efficient when the average reaches 50.

Teachers should, as far as possible, be trained in connection with the Universities. One of the chief levers used in obtaining the new Universities was

the necessity of providing University training for teachers. Most Rev. Dr. O'Dwyer, in 1901, in advocating the claims of teachers for a higher and broader culture, said: "Out of the vast masses of the people and not out of a limited class the intellectual power of a nation has to be recruited, and, on the other hand, unless the teachers are themselves men of culture, and are trained in true methods of teaching the education of our people will steadily fall to a lower level. Among the national teachers there is a number of supremely able men who have a high ideal of the dignity of their calling, and who desire to raise themselves intellectually to the level of it, but practically they receive no help to go further than the narrow course of their own training colleges." And in 1906, Canon Andrew Murphy, at the Mayothon Union, said: "For the training of teachers, if on no other ground, the University is essential to a sound scheme of education. The training of primary teachers is one of the mysteries of the national system which the mere outsider cannot be expected to understand. Nothing but the influx of the intellectual life of a University into the training colleges can ever remedy their helplessness in face of the problems which other countries have successfully solved."

The inspectorate should be recruited mainly from the teaching body. Every inspector should have practical experience in teaching, and a diploma in teaching should be an essential qualification, the teaching diploma of the Education Board to suffice for national teachers.

Selection should be by competition, and in the programme the practice and theory of teaching and actual inspection work should play an important part. Service marks should be awarded. No other method will give the gifted national teacher without "pull" or "private influence" a fair chance. A national teacher cannot be appointed principal of a school without a teaching diploma; yet under the present system of appointing inspectors, a man without a teaching diploma, with less teaching qualifications than the teacher, is appointed to inspect the teacher's work, and to show the teacher how to perform his duties.

An inspector should never suggest a change in the time-table or in the organisation of a school without coming specially to the school, remaining a day or days if necessary, taking charge, and giving practical illustration in the presence of the manager and teacher of how the changes he suggests can be carried out satisfactorily and without injury to the efficiency of the school, conferring as he goes along with the teacher, and showing how difficulties that arise as a result of the changes are to be overcome.

Minor suggestions about trifling matters can be taken down by the teacher in her own private notebook for consideration and trial.

Official hand-books containing specimen time-tables for every class of school, and showing how the different subjects can be allotted sufficient time should be issued to the teachers from the Education Office. These should be suggestive and in no way mandatory, and teachers should be encouraged to suggest improvements in them for future editions of the hand-book. Less necessary publications have been issued from the Education Office at the public expense. These specimen time-tables might also form a subject of discussion at the Education Conference which ought to be held between managers, teachers, and inspectors.

All rules restricting the liberty of the teachers should be abolished, and teachers given full civil and political freedom as in every other part of the British Empire.

In the interests of education as well as for the sake of the teachers, the inspectors, who as instruments of the administration have been responsible for the troubles notably in the Tipperary, Belfast, Wicklow and Carlow districts, should be removed, as their continued presence in their present districts can lead only to the continuance of suspicion and distrust, and lead to a constant state of friction detrimental to education.

APPENDIX LIII.

(Return handed in by Major Deane, Commissioner of National Education).

1st.—Date of meeting of National Education Board, and number of members present, at which Mr. Mansfield's dismissal was first proposed by me :—
September 17th, 1912. Fourteen members present.

2nd.—Number of members present, and votes for and against dismissal on October 15th, 1912 :—
Thirteen members present; 12 votes for dismissal; 1 vote against dismissal.

3rd.—Dates of all the meetings at which Mr. Mansfield's speech and letters were discussed :—

August 6th, 1912 ..	12 members present.
August 20th, 1912 ..	11 do.
Sept. 17th, 1912 ..	14 do.
October 15th, 1912 ..	13 do.

On September 3rd and October 1st, the subject was on our minutes but postponed, owing, as far as I can remember, to the non-arrival of replies or information we were awaiting.

These dates and figures have been copied by me, with Dr. Sturges's help, from the minutes of our Board.

GERALD DEANE.

5/9/13.

APPENDIX LIV.

(Statement handed in by Mr. Mansfield, Secretary Irish National Teachers' Organisation).

Copy of Letter addressed by Very Rev. M. P. Canon O'Neill, D.D., P.P., to the Commissioners of National Education. (This as well as Mr. Mansfield's letter to the *Freeman's Journal*, October 26th, 1912, and the letter of Very Rev. Father Pembroke, President of Rockwell College, was omitted from the correspondence sent to the Chief Secretary by the National Board).

"Lattin House, Tipperary,
"21/10/12

"GASTLEBURN—Mr. Mansfield has asked me to apply to the Commissioners for payment for last quarter, as his salary has not come to me with the salaries of the other teachers.

"I am very sorry, indeed, that the Commissioners have acted so harshly to Mr. Mansfield. They have deprived me of a teacher of great ability and capacity, a hard-working faithful man in the discharge of his duties. In my opinion, it is a wanton and a tyrannical exercise of authority to ruin such a teacher, his future prospects and family. The Commissioners and their administration should be open to all criticisms and capable of other defence than the blow cruelly inflicted on this good man. Such extreme punishment as summary dismissal in the circumstances seems to me unjust and unworthy coming from a body of men such as the Commissioners—
Yours truly,

(Signed), M. P. CANON O'NEILL, D.D.

APPENDIX LV.

(Handed in by Miss G. M. Mahon, President, Irish National Teachers' Organisation).

Penalties for Inefficiency.

At the meeting of the Commissioners of National Education on 2nd May, 1920, the following Order was made :—

When the Inspector's report shows that a certain teacher has discharged his school duties in a seriously inefficient manner during the previous year, the official action shall be as follows :—

"On the first occasion the teacher shall be reprimanded, and warned that a serious penalty will be inflicted if the proficiency of the school be not materially improved before the next annual examination of it.

"If, at the following examination, the proficiency be not found materially improved, and the report be again unsatisfactory, the penalty shall be temporary depression in classification for one or more quarters, with a corresponding or proportionate reduction of salary, together with a warning that if the signs of inefficiency are found to continue, the depression in classification will be made permanent after the next annual examination.

"If at an examination following a warning the proficiency of the school be found improved, but

after another year is found to have lapsed into an unsatisfactory condition, the penalty threatened will be inflicted. If, on the other hand, the satisfactory standard of proficiency is maintained for two or more years the series of penalties will commence de novo.

"The third penalty for continued inefficiency shall be permanent depression in classification with a warning that the teacher is retained only on trial for a year.

"The fourth penalty for continued inefficiency shall be dismissal or withdrawal of salary."

As the second or third penalty cannot be imposed in the case of third class teachers, the corresponding penalties in their case shall be fines proportioned to the degrees of inefficiency and to the incomes of the teachers.

By Order,

M. S. BRYMOUR, } Secretaries.
A. HAMILTON. }

Office of National Education
Dublin, May, 1899.

APPENDIX LVI.

(Headed in by Miss C. M. Mahon, President, I.N.T.O., furnished by Mr. T. J. Nunn, C.E.C.)

Assistant Teachers.

I first wish to draw attention to the matters especially troubling assistant teachers. The first of these is the question of

Promotion.

Of 12,800 teachers, 4,989 were assistants in the year 1911. The proportion of assistants is somewhat greater now, and is increasing.

Under the results system, assistants were eligible for promotion to the higher class. Practically all the assistants by study and efficient school work to go up the promotion ladder, and very few failed to go up some distance.

The conditions were definite and the reward definite.

In the Board's report for the year 1899, we find:—

91 assistants in 1st of 1st Class.

277 assistants in 2nd of 1st Class.

1,538 assistants in 2nd of 2nd Class.

In 1900, all assistants were condemned to 2nd Grade.

Financial Loss to Assistants.

In the year 1899, again we find:—

27 assistants had the salary attaching to 1st of 1st Grade.

34 assistants had the salary attaching to 1st Grade.

50 assistants had the salary attaching to 2nd Grade.

The maximum of Third Grade now marks the limit for all assistants.

Rule 103(c).

This rule of the Board states:—

"Assistants may be promoted beyond the 3rd Grade in exceptional circumstances and by special order of the Commissioners."

From 1900 to 1912, two assistants, out of 5,000, had been promoted under this Rule.

I wish to connect this fact with evidence of Mr. Dilworth (qn. 260-1, page 13).

He says: "We could not expend money on something not approved."

Assistants' promotion was approved, but only two out of 5,000, were promoted in 12 years.

Again (qn. 265), he states: "It is extraordinary the public generally think that we return money every year that we could spend for other purposes."

New Conditions.

The new conditions for promotion of assistants are given in Mr. Dilworth's evidence (qn. 163, page 9):

"To qualify for promotion to 2nd Grade an assistant must have given twelve years' service, and have six consecutive 'Very Good' private merit marks in the last six years of that service."

Thus an assistant may be marked "Excellent" for eleven years of the twelve, but if marked "Good" once in the last six years of his twelve years' service his promotion is lost.

(1) Further, inspectors will not know that these merit marks would afterwards be used to determine an assistant's promotion.

(2) Inspectors give the same merit mark to the various teachers in a school as they give to the school. Thus an inefficient principal prejudices the chances of promotion of an assistant, just as an inefficient assistant interferes with a principal's chance.

(3) These private merit marks are not made known to the assistant. An inspector refused to tell me mine. The assistant must work blindly for twelve years, only to learn that five or six years before his chance of promotion was killed.

My Own Case.

My private merit marks for the last six years were:—

1907	..	"Very Good."
1908	..	"Excellent."
1909	..	"Excellent."
1910	..	"Excellent."
1911	..	"Excellent."
1912	..	"Good."

From the minutes I quote the portions referring to myself:—

"1907.—Both teachers have succeeded in securing very satisfactory progress."

"The improvement in the junior and middle divisions is due to the energetic and capable work of the present assistant. The teacher's methods and the thought which he gives to his duties are deserving of very favourable mention."

"1908 (Different Inspector).—The teachers are very earnest, and capable, and the school continues to make very satisfactory progress. Suggestions for improvement are readily taken up, and the aim of the teachers is evidently to make their work as efficient as possible. Oral and written English are particularly well taught. The assistant deserves special credit for his efficient teaching of singing which is thoughtful and expressive."

"1909.—The teachers are skilful and hard-working, and maintain the school at a high level of efficiency in spite of drawbacks. All teaching is done in one room, and this imposes a severe test on the skill of the staff, yet the work goes on smoothly and efficiently."

"1910.—The teachers evidently work hard. The assistant's portion of the school is well taught. The infants are well taught. (The infants were solely in my charge)."

"1911.—The assistant is very capable."

"1912.—The general proficiency is 'Good.' (No favourable or unfavourable remark on my work)."

In 1913, my private merit mark is again "Very Good," and the minute contains:—

"The assistant's teaching of oral subjects is generally very intelligent and of pleasing interest."

Six months prior to the 1913 merit mark of "Good," the death of my wife broke up my home, sent me into lodgings, and caused me to send my infant child away to be reared. The resulting drop to "Good" after four "Excellent's" deprives me of any chance of promotion again for six years.

A Typical Case.

I quote this case, because it is the one I know best, and because I know it to be typical of a good many others. In evidence, I hand in the case of Mr. Coffey of Roll No. 12820, and Mr. McCarthy of Roll No. 14514.

I have received dozens of letters from assistants similarly treated.

Binding of Parliament.

On the 15th January, 1913, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell, M.P., asked in Parliament what the new regulations for the promotion of assistants were.

The reply was that "The Commissioners have made no change in the regulations, but they have always exercised the power which they possess under the existing rules in suitable cases, and since August last they have promoted twenty-three assistants to the Second Grade, and others are under consideration."

Exercising their power always during the twelve years ending in 1912, they promoted two assistants out of 5,000. They have made no change in the regulations," yet two are promoted in twelve years, and twenty-three are promoted in the four months from August, 1912, to January, 1913.

In Mr. Dilworth's evidence, he says:—"The Commissioners have recently framed this regulation."

Assistants who have been at the maximum of Third Grade, including bonus, for three years may be promoted to the Second Grade, provided they have had six consecutive "Very Good" reports."

The *Regulation* was framed in August, 1912. Mr. O'Donnell got the above reply in Parliament in January, 1913.

Points on these Conditions.

(1) The standard of efficiency and the length of service required are, of course, unreasonably high, but the condition that the six "Very Goods" must be consecutive brands the scheme as a gamble in which the assistant must win six times to win once, so to speak, and the Treasury has only to win once to cheat him out of his hard-earned reward.

(2) In the ordinary course, it would take thirty-six years to reach the Board's highest salary, granting that every one of the numerous conditions are fulfilled, and that there has never been the slightest hitch in this long service. Assistants who remain for sixteen years or more can never hope to reach it even with the most glowing reports.

Financial Loss in Specific Case.

I take the case of an assistant who gets "Good" as his private merit mark in his tenth, eleventh, or twelfth year of service, and who continues assistant for sixteen years—which is the case with a good many—his loss from that one "Good," even though his thirty-nine other reports are "Excellent" would be $4 \times £175 - 4 \times £86 = £256$.

Thus, if the present system continues, will very probably be my own case.

Important Resolution.

On June 24th last, the Central Council of Clerical Managers unanimously passed the following resolution:—

"That we consider the difficult provisions for the promotion of assistant teachers, as revealed in the minutes of evidence of the Commission not setting, discourage rather than foster zeal and ambition, and we would recommend that a more reasonable standard of promotion be adopted for these teachers."

(1) The hopelessness of the outlook tends to create apathy in the assistants;

(2) It makes those in the training colleges careless in their studies;

(3) The standard being so high prevents many from even trying to qualify.

(4) If zeal and ambition are not fostered in the early years of a teacher's career, they will not be found afterwards.

Board's Standard.

If the Board's standard for promotion of assistants is unreasonable, why should it not be taken as a headline by inspectors for the promotion of principals?

Assistants have no Confidence in the Board.

Again and again the assistants requested the Board to grant a reasonable system of promotion. It was always refused. In 1906, Mr. Thomas McDonnell, M.P., was informed by the Chief Secretary, that "the Commissioners did not approve of the demand," nor will they make an estimate of the cost.

In the Education debate in Parliament, in July, 1912, Mr. Birrell pressed by Messrs. Dillon and O'Donnell, agreed with the principle of a generous system of promotion for assistants. In August, the Board, driven on by Mr. Birrell's hint, laid down the new conditions for promotion.

"Swing of Ten."

It was similar in the case of this concession. The Board were again and again asked to concede it, but though assistants of twenty and thirty and more years' service, with families in most cases, were being yearly flung out on the roadside, because the average dropped a unit or less, the Board would not even ask power to make the concession we sought.

In May, 1916, Mr. O'Donnell is informed in Parliament that with regard to "the swing of ten," "the Chief Secretary was not aware that the Commissioners considered it advisable to take such a course."

In July, 1910, I had an interview with Mr. Birrell, who, when I explained the position fully to him, had handed him fifty cases selected from amongst hundreds I had received, where men and women of twenty, thirty, and even thirty-eight years' service—most of them with families depending on them—were to be flung out at the end of the quarter, and it was a "brutal arrangement that should go at once."

The Board, then (November 5th) passed a resolution in favour of the "swing."

My colleagues on the Executive give me full credit for winning this concession, which has increased the number of assistants, added stability to the staffing of the schools, and brought some thousands of pounds annually to Ireland.

My Reward.

by the Board was to *lose* us four days' salary.

I have recently been fined two days' salary, because I was absent for that time on a deputation to the Central Council of the Catholic Clerical Managers.

This is the Board's recognition of the Organisation.

Corporal Punishment Book.

In the Corporal Punishment Book, the rule is laid down that only the principal is allowed to give corporal punishment.

An assistant of ten, twelve, or twenty, or any number of years' service is thus put in the same position as an unpaid monitor, or grown schoolboy put in charge of a class.

This tends to destroy his authority in the school, it kills the pupil's respectful fear of the assistant, and if the principal for any reason refuses to punish a pupil it plays havoc with the discipline of the assistant's classes.

The assistant is a fully qualified teacher, and why he should not be allowed to preserve discipline and good moral tone in his own classes passes understanding.

Assistants have been *paid* £5 for a breach of this rule.

I give in evidence the case of the assistant in *Rail No. (Case 45F)*.

We ask a return to the old system in this respect.

Test, Circular and Assistants.

In large schools where "Very Good" or "Excellent" reports have been obtained for some time, an individual report on the merit of each assistant teacher may be omitted from the report: the principal teacher should be questioned regarding the work of the staff, and in case of complaint or dissatisfaction, a fuller investigation of the work of the teacher concerned should be made.

Assistants think this an unwise arrangement.

(1) The principal and assistant may not be friendly and this gives the principal power to put a ban on an assistant.

(2) It also allows him to shield a lazy assistant.

(3) Where before there was mutual confidence and sympathy there would now be easily bred doubt and distrust.

Let each teacher's work be tested by an honest outsider.

In Appendix IV. (VI.) (10a), page 162, we have the order:—"State your opinion of the work done by each member of the teaching staff," and (question 75) Mr. Dilworth says:—"In addition to the summing up of the work of the school generally, it is necessary in connection with the payment of increments to assistants to have the work of each member of the staff set forth."

Lowering of Reports.

I wish to quote a few very pointed cases of lowering in the third year of period. I give first the case of the principal teacher in the school in which I teach. Mr. Dilworth, in reply to question 61, page 3, says:—"Now the promotion of the Principal Teacher depends on the work of the school," and again in reply to question 63, he emphasises that statement.

Again to question 149, page 7, he replies:—"The standards of reports required for promotion are . . . from the Second Grade to the second section of First Grade "Good," "Very Good," "Very Good."

or "Very Good," "Good," "Very Good." The reports of the school have been:

1906 ..	"Very Good."
1909 ..	"Very Good."
1910 ..	"Good."

The minutes of 1906 and 1909 are full of praise of both teachers.

Promotion was asked for, but refused, because of the drop to "Good" in the third year, but a promise is given that his promotion will be considered in connection with next report.

The next report is "Very Good" (1911), and the minute contains this:—"The principal is earnest, and makes careful preparations."

He has now got:—

1909 ..	"Very Good."
1910 ..	"Good."
1911 ..	"Very Good."

Since 1911, the manager has written three times asking promotion for the teacher, but beyond the award of acknowledgment has got no reply.

The case is a flat contradiction of Mr. Dillworth's evidence on this point.

Another Case.—Roll No. 4761.

Teacher is here lowered in the third year in three successive triennial periods.

In 1900 ..	No merit mark is given, but minute is favourable.
1901 ..	No examination or inspection held.
1902 ..	"Fair."
1903 ..	"Good."
1904 ..	"Good."
1905 ..	"Very Fair."
1906 ..	"Good."
1907 ..	"Good."
1908 ..	"Fair."

Three successful "Goods" would give promotion to Second Grade. It is refused on each occasion. Finally pressure and influence gets it from 1st April, 1908, on:—

"Very Fair."
"Good."
"Good."

I hand in the statement.

Another Case.—Roll No. 5506.

Reports:—

1904 ..	"Very Good."
1905 ..	"Good."
1906 ..	"Good."

"Very Good" in 1906 would bring promotion to First Grade.

Here is the minute of 1905:—

"This school is in a healthy condition. Altho as regards proficiency, discipline, and general tone. The instruction in the various subjects is sound, and in nearly all good progress is shown. There is still much unpunctuality, which is the more disappointing in view of the good influence which the teachers have over their pupils."

This minute is good enough for "Excellent," or at least "Very Good." Still "Good" is the report and promotion is lost.

Inaccurate Evidence.

In the evidence of Mr. Dillworth, question 429 page 18. He states a teacher has not to begin afresh if his report is lowered in the third year. This is inaccurate.

In case of a teacher seeking promotion to Second Grade, or increment in First Grade, or promotion to First of First Grade, a drop in the third year necessitates his beginning afresh—it delays him three years.

Another point is, that a lowering in the first year delays him only one year whereas a lowering in the third delays him three years.

Thus, "Excellent," "Excellent," "Fair," delays him three years, while "Fair," "Good," "Good" delays him only one.

In Case Roll No. 63 H.

The only report worse than "Good" ever received in the school occurs in the third year—given by a new famous inspector—and blacked increment.

No principal in school from end of March till 1904 July and Assistant ill from 28th September till January, prior to inspection in March, 1902. All other reports very favourable yet increments lost, though Mr. Dillworth says:—"Adverse circumstances are taken into account."

I quote only pointed cases. I have omitted several where the service prior to or subsequent to the triennial period in which the third year's drop took place was not officially satisfactory.

Further, very many cases which we know to exist were not sent in either through a false shame, or through fear of official revenge.

Uniformity.

Here I select some pointed cases from a very large number received.

Roll No. 2811.

Mr. A., 1901 ..	No merit mark, but minute says:—"In all subjects the proficiency is very creditable."
Mr. B., 1902 ..	"Fair."
Mr. C., 1903 ..	"Excellent."
Mr. C., 1904 ..	"Good."
Mr. C., 1905 ..	"Very Good."

On the drop from "Excellent" to "Good," the only suggestions made are:—

"Analysis may be taught logically."
"Drill may be developed—marching."

The lady principal of this school is willing to swear if necessary, that the school was in the same state of proficiency in all the five years, same teachers, same children practically, no epidemics, same work, same methods, yet "substantial uniformity" has been reached.

Case Roll No. 12744.

1902.		
Reading ..	..	Bad.
Writing ..	..	Good.
Spelling ..	..	Fair.
Grammar ..	..	Bad.
Composition ..	..	Fair.
Drawing ..	..	Fair.
School discipline and Drill ..	..	Bad.
Arithmetic ..	..	Bad.
Report:—	"Fair."	

1903.		
Reading and Grammar ..	..	Fair.
Writing ..	..	Good.
Object Lessons ..	..	Good.
Composition ..	..	Good.
Drawing ..	..	Good.
School discipline and Drill ..	..	Middling.
Arithmetic ..	..	Fair.
Report:—	"Fair."	

Four "Bads" and three "Fairs," and one "Good."
"Fair" (1902).
One "Middling," two "Fairs," and three "Goods."
"Fair" (1903).

Mr. Dillworth states in reply to question 424, page 15:—"If the merit mark is not in consonance with the minute, or with the general statement under the head of proficiency of the pupils it is often sent back to them to consider the whole report."

Case Roll No. 14258.

1902.		
Reading ..	..	Good.
Writing ..	..	Very Good.
Spelling ..	..	Very Good.
Grammar ..	..	Good.
Composition ..	..	Good.
Arithmetic ..	..	Very Good.
Kindergarten ..	..	Fair.
Drawing ..	..	Good.
Object Lessons and Science ..	..	Good.
Needlework ..	..	Very Good.
Singing ..	..	Good.
School discipline and Drill ..	..	Excellent.
Report:—	"Good."	

1903.

Reading	..	..	Very Good.
Writing	..	..	Excellent.
Spelling	..	..	Very Good.
Grammar	..	..	Good.
Composition	..	..	Good.
Arithmetic	..	..	Very Good.
Kindergarten	..	..	Fair.
Drawing	..	..	Good.
Object Lessons and Science	..	..	Good.
Needlework	..	..	Very Good.
Singing	..	..	Good.
School discipline and Drill	..	..	Very Good.

Report—*excellent.*"

This uniformity speaks for itself.

In Case Roll No. 13210.—In March, 1909, g-1 "Middling." Appeal—same inspector in June, three months later—"and school has progressed wonderfully, and is now marked "Good."

Discourtesy.

One senior inspector was grossly discourteous to myself. He performed like a madman in the school, and shouted at the top of his voice, "the children know nothing." He pushed pupils roughly against me, and terrified the children.

A junior inspector who was in course of "training" openly "corrected" my teaching of singing, for which I have always been highly praised. He was wrong, yet though I pointed this out to him most respectfully, he persisted in his correction opposite the entire school. He then made a very foolish suggestion re division of labour, and insisted on it, though I pointed out to him how badly his suggestion would work out. I had to appeal to the district inspector, who soon after came in from the girls' school, and got his suggestion over-ruled.

I have had thirty-seven cases of complaints of gross discourtesy by eighteen different inspectors. These inspectors make rudeness the chief characteristic of their visits. It takes various forms: distrust, shouting, disparaging remarks made aloud, or open insult of the teacher.

I am prepared to go into each case if necessary. Discourtesy is generally accompanied by a bad report.

I beg to direct attention to a typical case, Roll No. 6062 (Case 27A), where in twelve years' reports which are a mixture of "Excellent," "Very Good," and "Good," the only "Fair" ever got accompanies bad temper of the inspector and grave rudeness. It is the last report of a triennial period, and blocks promotion to Second Grade. The inspector was since censured for inefficiency, but though the teacher did everything he could to explain the wrong he suffered, he got no redress.

Threat by Cookery Organizer.

In case (02) Roll No. 4331 (2A). A cookery organizer threatened that there would be no increment if cookery were not taught.

In case (2A), Roll No. 4590. School marked "Good" for six consecutive years, drops to "Fair" in seventh year, when "Good" would have given promotion to Second Grade.

Innocent and Misleading Evidence.

Mr. Dilworth, in reply to questions 562, 563, and 564 (page 27), says that a fine which means £2 or £3 is a matter that is always brought before the Board with full particulars, but as to mere cases of reprimand or admonition, they never come before the Board.

I wish to show that a reprimand involves a much more severe fine than the "fine" which comes before the Board.

A reprimand blocks on increment or promotion. A reprimand if not accompanied by financial loss to the teacher is only so much ink on paper.

The Board recognise this, and we find (page 145 of 1st Vol. of Evidence) in instructions to inspectors re increments on promotion:—"Teachers who have incurred any serious censure during the three preceding years are ineligible for promotion."

In the 2nd Vol. of Evidence, question 5061, page 49, Mr. Downing says:—"In the olden time reprimand meant only giving a slip to the teacher. There was no penalty, but now a reprimand is a very serious thing, because it would prevent promotion and increment, too."

I give a specific case (43F):—

An assistant broke the Corporal Punishment Rule by punishing a boy in June, 1908. The Board fines him £3.

In March, 1910, he applies for his increment which was then seven months due, and is informed by Mr. B. Wyse that owing to the acting, the Board was compelled to adopt towards him in 1908, the Board would not award the increment from the date on which it fell due, 16/5/09, but from 1/1/10. He is thus again fined four and a half months of increment—£3 12s. 6d., and every increment and promotion is delayed correspondingly.

There is thus a double fine.

Now, these "mere" reprimands are sent out by the examiner, and the matter lies entirely in his hands.

I can show that a reprimand now inflicts a loss of a very large sum to the teacher—a sum varying from £20 to £204 according to the time it is given, and to other circumstances.

This fine can be inflicted by a clerk in the office without the knowledge of the Board, the Resident Commissioner, or the Secretaries.

Illegal Acts of Board.

Under the Irish Education Act of 1892, assistant teachers of five years' standing are entitled to a bonus of £5 for men, and £7 10s. for women.

If these teachers give satisfactory service as assistants for nine years, the salaries are £77, and £9 bonus—£86; and in the case of women, £65, and £7 10s.—£72 10s.

On promotion of assistants to Second Grade, a similar plan is adopted.

If after receiving the bonus they become principals, then the bonus given them by law is made do duty for increment which they earn under the Rules of the Board, and they are allowed to rise only to £77 and £85, respectively.

I HOLD THIS TO BE ILLEGAL.

Illegality (2).

I next give the case of Roll No. 14772 (64F).

A mistake is made in fixing his salary in 1900. In 1911 the error is discovered, grade salary was revised, and arrears of £72 paid teacher.

In 1904, he had fulfilled every condition in the rules for promotion to First Grade, but his salary was not at the maximum of Second Grade, which it would be but for the clerical error made in 1900, and admitted in 1911.

After correction of error, teacher pointed out how the clerical error had kept him from promotion, but the reply of the Board is:—

"The recent revision of salary must be regarded as final."

It was not a revision, it was a correction of a clerical error, but there was no redress.

An exactly similar case is that of Roll No. 1388 (45F).

Illegality (3).

Roll No. 11507.

Teacher's salary cut to £44 from £50, because average was below 20. Next year it is up to 20, and salary of £50 is restored, but only £9 instead of £12 is paid, because "though the average for year is 20, it was maintained for only three-quarters."

In all their rules, there is none to justify this action. Fourth Report used to block increment where all conditions are fulfilled in Triennial period:—

I have three cases where this is done. Every condition is fulfilled within the triennial period, but a report from an incidental visit months after the triennial period ends is used to block increment or promotion.

The cases are—Roll Nos. 8545, 6253, and 1948.

In most cases increment or promotion are not given for months after being earned under the rules—often twelve months and over.

The presumption is that increments are delayed in the hope of something turning up to prevent its coming.

Typical Cases of Retardation.

I present a number of cases of really harsh treatment.

Case Roll No. 16015 (99).

A teacher taught cookery—twenty-four lessons. Could not have the necessary twenty-five lessons, for by rule the lessons should be given on the Wednesday as marked in Time Table, because the 17th March, 1900, fell on Wednesday, because Easter Vacation intervened, and because teacher was ill for a fortnight, and substitute employed had no certificate to teach cookery.

Over thirty lessons were actually given, but by rule only those taught on Wednesday counted.

Fees were refused, and though manager pressed hard, and explained position, not a penny was paid.

In February, 1912, the Board sent a Circular (attached) provided for cases like this, but the teacher has never got the fees earned.

Case Roll No. 15982.

Teacher after six weeks' illness in training failed in an unimportant teaching lesson. Teacher is "re-recognized" as assistant, and is doing splendid work—highly praised by Inspector—yet he has got neither

increment nor bonus though he is 7 years teaching. Though requested again and again to give the case special consideration, the Board has refused.

Case Roll No. 13482.

Gives an idea of the "generous" reward given for splendid service. Salary was fixed so that he has £76 after receipt of second increment. He takes charge of a school of over 85 average, and raises school from a nomination of poor reports to "Good" for three successive years. Reward—£1 increment, bringing him to maximum of Third Grade.

Case Roll No. 16262 (17F).

Here we have a case of school organisation, which had worked beautifully for nine years, under three or four different inspectors, interfered with by a new inspector.

Though teacher gives the most solid reasons against the suggested change, the Board backs the Inspector, though they could not put to a single rule in the Code to support his position.

Case (924) Roll No. 12275

is a good instance of red-tape.

A fully qualified assistant teacher lost her promotion, through a fall in average. She is appointed workmistress, but has to attend a special examination at her own expense to qualify to be workmistress at £12 a year.

APPENDIX LVII.

(Headed in by Miss G. M. MASON, President, I.N.T.O.; furnished by Mr. R. JUDON, Chairman, Portladora N.T.A., Poyntiaspa Mixed N.S., Co. Armagh).

PAPER PROMOTION.

Violation of vested rights of Teachers caused by Commissioners of National Education failing to observe their own Rules, viz. :—

- 102 (c).
- 104 (a).
- 104 (c).
- 105 (a).
- 108 (a).
- 108 (b).

PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT.

METHOD OF FILLING VACANCIES.

UNDUE DELAY IN PAYMENT.

FINANCIAL LOSS TO TEACHERS.

Paper Promotion.

The above grievance which is without a parallel in the annals of Irish Primary Education is caused by the violation of the principal rules governing the pay and promotion of teachers.

In order that the extent of this grievance may be fully understood, it is necessary to state that, prior to 1900, all teachers when promoted to a higher class received immediately the full increase of salary to which they were entitled according to the then rules.

In 1900 the vested rights of the teachers as regard promotion were swept away, and new rights established.

Early in 1901, the Commissioners of National Education issued a pamphlet to the managers and teachers of Schools, setting forth the conditions of promotion, the cases of salary, increments, &c., applicable to all Principal and Assistant Teachers.

I may here mention that the Irish National Teachers' Organisation protested most strongly against some of the New Rules, especially as regards the slow rate of promotion and the small number of teachers who could hope to attain to the higher grades owing to the average barrier, an average of 50 at least being required for 1st and 70 for 2nd Grade, whereas under the old system an average of 35 only was required for 1 and 1 Class. The storm, however,

was soon quelled as the Resident Commissioner, in a speech delivered in Belfast, informed us that the Commissioners had it in their power to grant special promotions to highly efficient teachers to any grade, and such promotions were given until 1908. The rules issued in 1901, received the sanction of the Treasury, and were accepted by the teachers, who fully believed that the rules then issued and the promises publicly made would be faithfully kept, when the teachers on their part fulfilled the many conditions laid down.

No one thought that a part—an indefensible part—had been withheld, and that a few years would prove that the rules of promotion were a mockery so far as men of long and faithful service were concerned.

The first promotions under the New System were awarded in 1903, and from that up to 1908, men with 8, 10, 12 and 15 years' service received immediately on promotion to the higher grades (1st, 1st) the salary attached to those grades; some even were so fortunate as to secure "special promotion" at a comparatively early age to 1st and 1st Grades with immediate cash benefits.

All now is changed, and we find men of 20, 25, 30, 40 and 45 years' service whose records can only be described as brilliant denied the same measure of justice and fair play as was meted out to their younger brethren during the years mentioned.

In July, 1908, we were informed by a circular from the Education Office that a Treasury regulation existed owing to which the Commissioners could not pay the higher rate of grade salary from date of promotion to men promoted to either section of First Grade.

We then became aware for the first time that the Commissioners had not put down all the conditions of promotion in the 1901 Rules, and that our vested rights were to be violated by this hitherto hidden and most unjust barrier.

Why was this regulation not made known in 1901? The reason is obvious.

In 1906 the "paper promotion" era began, and with it one of the most galling grievances that ever disgraced the administration of any public board.

On the next page is a copy of the notice which is

sent to all teachers who receive what is now known as "paper promotion."

"Promotion of Teachers from Lower to Higher Grades."

Office of National Education,
Dublin, 13th September, 1910.

County Armagh, Roll No. 4860.
School—Poyntaspaw Mixed.

REVEREND SIR—I am directed to inform you that the Commissioners of National Education having fully considered the reports on the service of Mr. Robert Judge, together with the official records of his career, have been pleased to order that he be promoted to the Second Section of First Grade of National Teachers from the 1st April, 1910.

I am to state that owing to the limitation of the number of masters entitled to receive payment of salary at the rate attached to the second section of the First Grade, at any one time, and as the number fixed has now been reached it is not possible at present to increase his salary. His claim to the salary at £117 will be considered, with the cases of the other principal teachers who have been similarly promoted as vacancies occur in the Grade.

The date from which service entitling to increment in the section of First Grade shall count is the date from which payment in that section of the grade shall have been awarded.—I am, rev. sir, your obedient servant,

(Signed), W. J. DELWORTH,
Secretary.

Rev. W. F. Johnson, M.A.,
Poyntaspaw.

I now wish to emphasize the fact that no mention whatever was made in the 1901 Rules or in the Code of Rules issued yearly by the Commissioners of "the limitation of the number of masters entitled to receive payment of salary at the rate attached to the second section of First Grade, or to the first section of First Grade."

The following are the Rules violated. They were, as I have pointed out, issued in 1901, and have appeared in the Code of Rules issued since with some modifications—modifications detrimental to the teachers' vested rights:—

I.—102 (c) "The number of teachers recognised in each grade above the Third Grade is fixed from time to time by the Commissioners." In 1912-13, Rules the words "under arrangement with the Treasury" appear for the first time. The Commissioners proclaimed to all, from 1901 to 1911, that they alone had the power to fix the number; but when this claim to power was pointed out to them by the aggrieved teachers they replied by affixing "Under arrangement with the Treasury."

II.—101 (a) Promotion from a lower to a higher grade, and from the second to the first section of the highest grade depends on (a) training; (b) position in school; (c) ability; (d) good service; (e) seniority; (f) sufficient average of school.

Please observe there is no mention here of the limitation of the number of masters, &c. "Vacancies" is not a condition of promotion.

III.—104(c) "Promotions date from 1st April." My promotion notice dates from 1st April, 1910, but after waiting for two full years for the increase in salary legally due to me from that date, I received a cheque for £7 10s. 6d. Grade salary, payable from 1st July, 1911 which date I was to regard as the actual date of promotion. The promotions of the other men are also made to date from various dates, viz.:—1st, 25th, 23rd October; 1st, 16th November; 16th February, &c.

IV.—105 (a) A teacher promoted from a lower to a higher grade receives on promotion the salary fixed for the grade to which promoted, but as a rule without any immediate addition of continued good service salary.

This rule has been violated in respect of each of the men promoted to 1st or 1st since 1910, and in respect of a few in 1909, thereby causing a loss in

Grade salary to each teacher of sums ranging from £5 to £21, and a further loss in the "Birrell Grant" from £1 10s. to £5 5s. A close study of the above rule discloses the fact that the Commissioners could lessen the grievance somewhat by taking advantage of the words "but as a rule, &c."

V.—108 (a) "A special rate of salary (called the Grade Salary) is fixed for each grade of teachers." Men teachers promoted to 1st and 1st do not receive this "special rate of salary from date of promotion."

VI.—108 (b) "Awards of continued good service are made triennially to teachers of schools when the average is sufficient, the work done in the school shows merit and the general condition of the school is satisfactory."

The underlined part in the 1909-10 Rules reads:— "When the Commissioners are satisfied that the work done in the schools is satisfactory, and that reasonable progress has been made in the proficiency of the pupils." Please note the difference.

Now, Rule 108 (b) is contradicted by the second barrier in the notification of promotion, so that a teacher drawing a grade salary of £107 per annum and promoted to 1st Grade from 1st April, 1910, and only paid from 1/7/11 could not receive an increment of continued good service salary, no matter how brilliant his services, but must wait until 1/7/14, thus being deprived of 1½ years of his next increment of £10, amounting to £12 10s. besides the 1½ years of £12 lost already by the breaking of Rule 105 (a). Also as promotion dates only from 1st April, he will be two years retarded in his advancement to 1st Grade, and must forego on that account two years' increase (£24). Again, as the three increments which bring his salary to the maximum of 1st Grade will each be delayed by 2 years, he will lose £24 in each triennial period, and thus the total loss will be £124 15s.

Should he receive a similar drawback when promoted to 1st through the operation of the "Standard Numbers," his total loss will be about £221.

The most cruel part of the paper-promotion grievance is caused by cancelling the satisfactory service given during the enforced period of waiting.

By the violation of these rules, a system of preferential treatment is adopted, and the scriptures are indeed fulfilled "to him that hath shall be given."

Mr. A. in receipt of £155 Grade salary, 20 years' service; records for triennial period, "Good," "Very Good," and "Excellent" receives an increment of £12.

Mr. B., his neighbour, in receipt of £107, 12 years' service; records for same three years, "Good," "Very Good," and "Excellent" is denied his increase of £10, and is rewarded with "Paper" promotion. Furthermore, the service given by Mr. A. is allowed to count in his next increment of £5, bringing him to the maximum of 1st, whilst Mr. B. is deprived of 1 year 3 months satisfactory service equivalent to a loss of £12 10s. Again, the system of awarding the vacancies is not, in my opinion, fair, as we find men of 18 years' service getting the preference to those who have given 20 and 46 years' service. Mr. A. with 18 years' service received his Grade salary three months before Mr. Q., who had 46 years' service, and 6 months before Mr. J. who had 20 years' service.

When these irregularities were pointed out, I was informed by a letter dated 11th December, 1911, that: "The names have been dealt with in accordance with the procedure laid down by the Board two years ago. The men have been taken in order of seniority of service, but those in charge of very large schools, and those whose reports have been highly satisfactory for a long period (not less than six years) have been taken in precedence of the others."

We have here again another hidden rule which violates that of the Code 104 (a). Again, the grievance is aggravated by the unnecessary delay in filling the vacancies as will be seen from the accompanying time at the end of this statement which shows the service records, financial loss, &c., sustained by each of the affected teachers.

Prior to the Tweedmouth Commission, something like Standard Numbers existed in the Dublin G.P.O.,

at least, in the case of first and second class telegraphists, but the restriction was abolished after that inquiry; Cash promotion, based on efficiency, was substituted, and the Civil Service was purged of such a limitation, yet many years later it was imposed on Irish teachers.

In other public services it would not be tolerated, and, therefore, does not exist. Vested rights are to sacred to be trifled with, and when schemes of University Education and the ownership of land were altered some years ago, established interests were religiously guarded. We look upon "paper" pro-

motion as a violation of the vested rights of all teachers who accepted service under the conditions forced in 1901, for until 1906 we were led to believe that the Commissioners were supreme in the matter.

We, therefore, claim that so long as the present system of pay and promotion continues in force that the written rules of the Commissioners—the rules which appeared in the Code from 1901 to 1911 be faithfully observed, and that all the men affected be paid the arrears of Grade salary and increments legally due to them.

TABLE SHOWING THE SERVICE, RECORDS, FINANCIAL

No.	Name.	School or Roll No.	Service.	Record.	Grade to which promoted and date.
1	J. Quigley ..	Malin Head ..	46	G., G., VG., VG., G.	P 1/4/10
2	J. Francy ..	Slatt N.S. ..	41	G., G., VG., VG	P 1/4/12
3	T. J. Kelly ..	14,197 ..	39	G's. & VG's.	1 1/4/12
4	M. Hegarty ..	Lishallad ..	37	G., 3 VG's. ..	1 1/4/10
5	D. O'Shea ..	2,696 ..	36	6 VG's. ..	1 1/4/12
6	E. Timlin ..	Killish ..	34	G's & VG's. ..	1 1/4/12
7	P. T. Woods ..	Newton R. ..	34	2 VG's., 3 Ex.	1 1/4/12
8	J. E. McVicker ..	Stewartstown ..	33	5 VG's., 5 Ex.	1 1/4/10
9	J. Mangan ..	12116 Cir. 14a ..	32	6 VG's. ..	P 1/4/11
10	P. Carey ..	Baltimore ..	30	7 VG's. ..	P 1/4/11
11	S. McElroy ..	Ballynodd ..	29	G., G., G., VG., VG.	P 1/4/11
12	W. Glendinning ..	Dartrey House ..	30	8 VG's., 1 Ex.	P 1/4/11
13	M. McElroy ..	14472 ..	27	6 VG's. ..	P 1/4/09
14	E. B. Robson ..	16012 ..	28	VG's., Ex. ..	P 1/4/10
15	M. Quigley ..	4414 ..	26	6 VG's. ..	P 1/4/12
16	J. Cotter ..	6437 ..	27	8 VG's. & 1 Ex.	P 1/4/12
17	P. Donnelly ..	Mulranny ..	26	5 VG's. ..	P 1/4/10
18	G. Smith ..	Park Road, Portadown.	25	3 G's., 2 VG's.	P 1/4/01
19	T. McGuinness ..	Greaghafarna ..	23	7 VG's. ..	P 1/4/12
20	J. Kennedy ..	Castletownreche ..	25	6 VG's. ..	P 1/4/14
21	R. Judge ..	Poyntzpass ..	22	G., VG., 4 Ex's.	P 1/4/10
22	M. Hogan ..	Skeries ..	20	G., 3 VG's. ..	P 1/4/10
23	J. Bradley ..	Arney ..	21	VG's. & Ex's.	P 1/4/10
24	D. Gean ..	Lettershambo ..	19	4 VG's. ..	P 1/4/01
25	C. McCarthy ..	Ballinakilla ..	22	6 VG's. ..	P 1/4/10
26	M. Henchy ..	Bullawn ..	18	G., 3 VG's. ..	P 1/4/10
27	J. J. Forsythe ..	Clonakilty ..	21	3 VG's. ..	P 1/4/09
28	J. F. O'Farrell ..	7443 ..	14	VG's. ..	P 1/4/09
29	D. Hickey ..	15335 ..	17	6 VG's. ..	P 1/4/10
30	M. McCarthy ..	Kennmare Boys ..	-	5 VG's. ..	P 1/4/10
31	M. McCarthy ..	Ahhayside ..	18	5 VG's. ..	P 1/4/11
32	T. P. Keville ..	Dromore, Down, now Lurgan.	16½	VG's. ..	P 1/4/11
33	J. Cahill ..	Moyleagh ..	29	4 VG's. ..	P 1/4/11
34	J. Purdy ..	Kilbroney ..	12½	2 G's., 4 VG's.	P 1/4/11
35	T. J. McCready ..	14417 ..	19	6 VG's. ..	P 1/4/11
36	Joseph Mills ..	13833 ..	19½	6 VG's. ..	P 1/4/11
37	P. Heron ..	8211 ..	Not known	VG's. ..	P 1/4/11
38	James M. Sloan ..	Straid ..	20	3 VG's., 6 Ex's.	P 1/4/12
39	James Logan ..	Upper Tannybrake ..	15	3 VG's., 9 Ex's.	P 1/4/12
40	J. P. O'Connell ..	Ardsagh ..	19½	6 VG's. ..	P 1/4/12
41	D. McLaughlin ..	Tartaraghna ..	13	3 G's., 4 VG's.	P 1/4/12
42	J. O'Neill ..	2441 ..	20	G's., 2 VG's. ..	P 1/4/12
43	A. Purdy ..	15400 ..	24	VG's. ..	P 1/4/12
44	J. Ryan ..	4332 ..	15	6 VG's. ..	P 1/4/12
45	D. Orr ..	10649 ..	22	1 VG., 6 Ex's.	P 1/4/12
46	P. Loughlin ..	1374 ..	14	6 VG's. ..	P 1/4/12
47	J. Rafferty ..	10003 ..	18	G's., VG's., Ex.	P 1/4/12
48	James Kelly ..	7580 ..	29	G., 5 VG's. ..	P 1/4/12
49	W. J. Alexander ..	12758 ..	20	4 VG's., 3 G's., 3 VG's.	P 1/4/12
50	J. O'Dowd ..	14256 ..	22	1 Ex., 5 VG's.	P 1/4/12
51	J. Connor ..	Brookfields ..	-	2 G's., 4 VG's.	P 1/4/12
52	T. F. Magher ..	Ballydrehid ..	14	VG's. ..	P 1/4/12
53	D. Daly ..	16121 ..	16	6 VG's. ..	P 1/4/12
54	J. Murphy ..	14797 ..	22	4 Ex's., 2 VG's.	P 1/4/12
55	D. J. Kyle ..	Both of Lurgan ..	-	Not known ..	P 1/4/12
56	J. Kyle, B.A. ..	..	-	Not known ..	P 1/4/12

APPENDIX LVIII.

(Compiled in by Miss C. M. Nokes, President L.N.T.O.; furnished by Mr. Thomas J. O'Connell, Stramstown, Co. Westmeath; Chairman, Naillingar Teachers' Association, and Hon. Secretary, Co. Westmeath Teachers' Association).

The statement deals with the following matters:—

- (1) Rule 92(j).
- (2) Delays in Issuing Reports.
- (3) Rule 127(b).
- (4) Rules re admission of visitors to National Schools, and some objectionable "Practical Rules."
- (5) Promotions, Salaries, &c.
- (6) Teachers in Small Schools.

RULE 92(j).

History of the Rule.

The Rule, which in its original form came into operation in July, 1911, was adopted by the Commissioners of National Education at their meeting 4th April, 1911, and an announcement of its adoption was, about a fortnight afterwards, inserted in the daily Press, in the form of an advertisement. This advertisement appeared while the Bangor Congress was sitting, and the teachers there assembled immediately wired to the Board a strong resolution protesting against the Rule. No notice was taken of this protest, and some ten weeks later the Rule came into operation.

Insufficient Notice.

Teachers were never directly informed of the existence of the Rule. A notice was apparently sent to the managers; but in outlying districts, where a daily paper is a luxury and where very often the manager lives at a considerable distance from the school, and through chance or neglect did not communicate to the teacher the contents of the official notice, the first intimation that teachers received of the "Rule" was to find it in the new Code of Rules and Regulations, which is usually sent out from the Office in August or September, and thus it happened that there are cases in which teachers failed to comply with the conditions of the Rule, and had their salary accordingly withheld, owing to this, but quite excusable ignorance of even the existence of such a regulation.

Rule Inoperable.

The outcry against the Rule was general among the teachers from the outset. It was recognised that it would prove in practice to be altogether unworkable. The advertisement columns of the daily Press and class journals seemed with advertisements for qualified women teachers to act as substitutes for two or three months, and it soon became evident that the supply of these substitutes was not by any means unlimited. More than one woman spent the last month of her pregnancy in a nerve-racking but fruitless search for a substitute. I hold a number of letters received during this critical period by a teacher in the south of Ireland. The letters are evidently replies from girls to whom the teacher had written requesting them to act as substitutes for her—all stated that they were otherwise engaged. This poor woman died shortly after her confinement; and her husband, who is also a teacher, when writing to me, made very strong statements, indeed, as to the effect the worry and anxiety, which were a direct consequence of the Rule, had upon the health of his wife.

The Board must have recognized the great difficulty which teachers had experienced in providing substitutes, for in the 1912-1913 edition of the Code, a modification of Rule 92(j) appeared in the following terms:—

"In exceptional cases, where it has been found impossible to obtain fully-qualified substitutes for married women who are compelled to absent themselves from school under the provisions of this Rule, the Commissioners may sanction, with the approval of the managers, competent persons to act as substitutes although not fully qualified under the Rules."

During the summer and autumn of 1912, considerable attention was directed to the rule in the columns of the daily Press, and some cases of extreme hardship were mentioned in the House of Commons during the Education Debate of that year. Mr. Birrell was evidently much impressed by their instances, and expressed himself rather strongly on the matter, and finally owing to his intervention, the Rule was withdrawn in October, 1912, in so far as it affected teachers who were in the service in July, 1911, and teachers who up to that time had had their salaries withheld, or who were forced to employ and pay substitutes, were recompensed the amount so withheld or expended.

Alleged Objects of the Rule.

In the course of a reply to Sir W. Nugent, in the House of Commons, on August 5th, 1912, Mr. Birrell stated, that "the reasons which led the Commissioners to introduce Rule 92(j) were, that the Commissioners considered the Rule a salutary one both in the interest of the health of the teacher and the efficiency of the public service."

The Rule has had exactly the opposite effect to that contemplated by the Commissioners.

The "Health" Argument.

The worry and trouble of making arrangements in connection with the appointment of a substitute, coupled with the anxiety which any good teacher must naturally feel in entrusting her school to the tender mercies of an unqualified or at least poorly qualified and inexperienced substitute cannot surely have anything but a deleterious effect on the health of a prospective mother. While on the other hand, it is generally admitted, and medical men as a rule hold, that at this period, a woman should follow the usual avocation, and that anything which would cause her to dwell on, or brood over, her coming trouble, should be specially avoided. Furthermore, very many women teachers are under the advice of their medical attendant for a long period before their confinement. I have never heard of a case in which a doctor advised a woman that her condition (provided it was normal) interfered in any way with her school duties or that these duties affected her health injuriously.

Again, under the Rule, the teacher has to pay a substitute (or have her salary withheld) at the very time when maternity is required to secure competent medical and nursing attendance, and to purchase commodities necessary for the health of mother and infant.

The "Efficiency" Argument.

Under the former regulations, a teacher on the occasion of her confinement closed her school for a month, and generally was able to take up duty at the end of that time. Under Rule 92(j) a substitute must be appointed for two months (three months until this year), and any teacher of experience will bear me out when I say that the school suffers rather than benefits by this arrangement. Teaching a school cannot be placed in the same category as selling Postal Orders, working a typewriter, or attending a loom. "Different teachers, different methods" is a generally recognised maxim. Even a highly qualified and experienced teacher will find a difficulty in taking up the work of a school, and continuing it right off from the point at which the previous teacher laid it down; and it has often happened that under the provisions of the rule, a teacher on going back to her school, instead of taking up work where she herself left off a month before, finds that she has to spend a considerable time in undoing the work of the substitute. In fact, the appointment of substitutes for teachers for short periods should as far as possible be avoided in the interests of educational efficiency.

And we must remember that there is absolutely no evidence to show that "the efficiency of the public service," suffered in any way under the old Rule. The inspectors in their annual reports have never called attention to what has been recently officially styled "a great abuse."

On the other hand, there is overwhelming evidence, and the Board's own records will provide it, to show that, as is only natural to expect, married women teachers can more than hold their own with their unmarried sisters in the profession. The number of married women teachers is only slightly over one-third the number of those unmarried, yet during the period 1900-1911, 48 married women as against 43 unmarried women, succeeded in carrying off the Carle and Blake Prizes. Many of these Carle and Blake prize-winners were the mothers of large families.

Present Rule should be withdrawn.

The Rule, as originally framed, swept away the vested rights of teachers. These, however, after eighteen months' agitation have now been restored by the Board. But apart from the question of vested rights, exactly the same arguments against the Rule will hold in the case of incoming teachers. It is manifestly unjust, if not illegal, to deprive a married woman of a privilege accorded to others in the service under §2(b). There must be something wrong in a regulation which allows a woman, who spends her night at a dance, a month's leave of absence with full pay, but denies her this privilege should her absence be caused by the birth of a future citizen.

The Rule penalises motherhood. The birth of a child means a fine on the mother. I need scarcely point out the positive dangers to morality inherent in such a regulation.

I might also draw attention to the following remarkable statement made by Mr. Birrell, in the House of Commons, on August 5th, 1912, in reply to a question by Sir Walter Sargent—

"Before making the Rule (§2(j)), the Commissioners did not consult any of the various bodies referred to (i.e., the various Managers' Associations, or the National Teachers' Organisation). . . . So far as I know, no medical authority was consulted."

This latter statement is especially noteworthy when we remember that there is not even one medical gentleman among the twenty Commissioners of National Education.

Particulars of several hundred cases have been sent to the C.R. Committee. I select six, which I trust will be sufficient to illustrate some of the hardships which the regulation inflicted.

(A). Case of Mrs. O'CONNELL, of Streamstown G.N.S. Roll No. 12293. Co. Westmeath.

Mrs. O'Connell was confined on 16th February, 1912. In order to comply with the Rule, she had been negotiating some time about the previous Christmas with a girl who lived about ten miles from her, and had previously secured her services as substitute, when the latter became ill, and estimated that she would not be able to act. Advertisements were then inserted in the *Irish Independent* on six occasions during February and March, but no replies were received. Having consulted her doctor and manager, Mrs. O'Connell returned to school on 19th March. Her child had died a few moments after birth. The Board held that she should have absented herself from school for three months dating from February 16th, and withheld her salary for this period (with the exception of the Easter Vacation). The salary withheld amounted to £18 17s. 8d. On April 24th (one of the days for which the Board refused salary), the senior inspector visited the school held the annual inspection, and marked the school "Very Good." The manager placed the whole circumstances of the case before the Board, enclosing a certificate from the *Independent Newspaper Co.* to the effect that no replies were received to the various advertisements, and stating also his own opinion that Mrs. O'Connell did everything possible to secure a substitute; and Mrs. O'Connell wrote personally to Dr. Beakie and gave him the full particulars of the case. Yet the Board refused to alter its decision. When these facts were mentioned by Mr. Dillon during the Education Debate of July 31st, 1912, Mr. Birrell stated that "this was surely the reflex of absurdity, and anything more hard could hardly be imagined."

Case B. Roll No. 14762. Co. Clare.

(Extract from statement by Mrs. —, Principal of above school.)

"About the middle of February, I looked for a substitute, but not find anyone. I then got my manager to write to Education Office, stating my circumstances, and requesting that they would not enforce the Rule in my case; but they wrote him, stating that a qualified substitute should be got, &c. I then advertised twice in *Teachers' Journal*, and sent four advertisements twice to *Daily Independent*, and also wrote to the Superior, Training College, Limerick, but failed to get a substitute, and I have documentary evidence to prove so. In the end, I managed to procure a substitute for 1st April, but I could not occasionally keep her longer than 31st May (two months) as she was getting another substitute from a companion in training, with the hope of permanent employment, which she ultimately got. . . . I paid her £7, and notwithstanding that my manager wrote explaining how I could not get a substitute, the Commissioners fined me (withheld) £10 17s. 1d. for the month—June—that I returned to school. My total loss was therefore £17 17s. 1d. . . ."

Case C. Roll No. 4883. Co. Tyrone.

(Extract from statement by Mrs. —, Junior Assistant Mistress in above school.)

"I was appointed to above school in January, 1910. It is a mixed school, but the average never reached 35 since my appointment, nor did the average of girls ever reach 20. Hence I am paid by capitation (5s. per unit of girls). I was obliged to employ a substitute in accordance with §2(j) from 3rd July of present year (1912) to end of September. My salary for same quarter was £3 10s. being capitation grant on 10 girls. I paid for the board and lodging of substitute 10s. per week, and paid her £1 12s. 6d. at the end of her term. Vacation began on 1st September, hence I was able to dispense with my substitute on 31st August. The time she worked in school was therefore nine weeks. This meant £4 10s. for board and lodging plus £1 12s. 6d. wages. I therefore lost £6 2s. 6d. by Rule §2(j)."

Case D. Roll No. 818. King's Co.

(Extract from statement by Mrs. —, Assistant teacher in above school.)

"I engaged a substitute for three months from 15th February last (1912). After two months, she got ill and was unable to continue and sent word to that effect late on Saturday evening—April 13th—the last day of Easter Vacation. On the following day, Sunday, to prepare for school opening next day, and to try and find a way out of the difficulty, I had to travel between five and six miles to Portladdington, to see the senior inspector about the matter. Next day, Monday, I had to go to Tullamore, ten miles away, to look for a substitute, whom I did not get. My baby was then only five weeks old. Mr. Dalton, however, sent me one from Mountmellick, to take up work on Tuesday, 16th. I had to accommodate this lady for a month at very great inconvenience to myself and family. The monetary loss . . . was £10 3s. 4d. which was not to be compared with the annoyance, worry, and inconvenience—in a very delicate state of health.

"I may add that the Commissioners stopped £3 1d. for the day (Monday, 14th April) that I had no substitute, and was travelling all day looking for one when very badly able for it. My total loss was therefore £10 6s. 5d."

Case E. Roll No. 2169. Co. Kildare.

(Extract from statement by husband of Mrs. —, Principal of above school.)

"(Date of confinement, 8/2/12).

"We advertised a fortnight before school reopened (after Xmas holidays) and two advertisements were fruitless. As it is Confirmation year,

the manager did not like the school in question to be left with only one teacher. The school opened on January 15th. There was in the neighbourhood a young lady who was over from England on holidays, and she had taught some in England. (She is at present teaching in Yorkshire at 265 a year). Article 51, she told us, was her qualification. She told us that several girls with her certificate had filled substituteships in Ireland. So she began duty here on January 15th. We wrote the Commissioners, asking if her qualifications were sufficient. When she was here three weeks, the reply came that she did not seem to be qualified, and they referred to the Rule re qualifications required. Not wishing to leave the school understaffed, we kept her on till a fortnight after when we secured an ex-monitrice as the result of an advertisement. The other girl then left, her last service day being 16th February. We then kept the new one four weeks. Thus we had done:—

4 Weeks' Vacation.

5 Weeks' Sub. No. 1.

4 Weeks' Sub. No. 2.

Mrs. —'s salary paper duly arrived, and underneath, I show how it and we had been treated at headquarters. We were paying and being paid simultaneously:—

	Amounts applied for.	Amount sanctioned by Office.
Salary	£ s. d. 14 10 0 0 6 6 (Pens.)	£ s. d. 9 4 10 0 6 6
Capital	14 3 6	8 18 4
Ang. G.	15 0 0 7 0 0	13 12 10 6 7 4
	36 3 6	28 18 6

They changed 3 months into 58 days.

NOTE.—The 58 days end are:—

January (16th to end)	17 days.
February (1 to 16th)	16 "
"	33 "

You see we are at a very big loss by the matter—5 weeks' sub's pay plus £7 3s.—about £16."

Case F. Roll No. 10070. Co. Roscommon.

(Extracts from statements made by Mrs. —, Principal of above school).

"In due time (January, 1912), I advertised in *Irish Daily Independent* on three successive dates for a substitute, and failed to get replies. I also wrote to the Principals of Carysofort, Limerick and Belfast Training Colleges, to know if they could inform me of anyone who would act as substitute, but they could not give me a single name. I can safely say I did all in my power to obtain a substitute, but could not get one.

"The school was closed for Christmas Vacation, from 22nd December to 15th January (inclusive). Re-opened on 16th January by assistant, who is trained, &c., and who conducted the school until my return on 13th February. I was then four weeks absent. Now, before returning to school, I wrote to Dr. Starks, stating the circumstances of my case, and asked him what I was to do. I got a letter from Mr. Wynn by return, which ran thus:—

'Circumstances of your case do not warrant Commissioners departing from the Rule.'

"After I got this letter, the manager came to the house to me, and asked me, for the sake of keeping up efficiency, &c., to return to school next day. I did so at his request. He said he could not imagine for a moment that I would suffer by doing so.

"When the salaries came down in April, I was minus £14 7s. 3d. of the amount. They allowed me for the vacation—no more.

"The replies I got from the Training Colleges were sent by the manager to the Education Office: they were not returned. He got a communication from the Office when there were sent up to say,

that my salary would be stopped for three months, save period covered by vacation and substitute. Now, when the "salaries" came down, the manager wrote again demanding the amount stopped, and I enclose the letter he received:—

(COPY OF LETTER).

'Office of National Education,
Dublin, 2nd May, 1912.

'Reverend Sir,—Referring to your letter of the 17th ultimo regarding the reduction made from the salary of the teacher of the above-named school for the last quarter, under the provisions of Rule 52(f), I am directed by the Commissioners of National Education to express regret that the decision in regard to the matter, as already notified to you, cannot be altered.—I am, Reverend Sir, your obedient servant,

P. E. LEMASS,
Secretary.'

"The assistant conducted the school in my absence. She is trained and fully qualified in every sense. She got her full salary and *Birrell Grant*."

Numerous other instances of unsympathetic treatment and of utter disregard of special circumstances, especially in the case of premature confinements might easily be cited; but the above will be sufficient to show that the financial losses entailed by the Rule formed only a small part of the objections which could be urged against its adoption and enforcement.

Had the Commissioners given the matter the serious consideration which so important a subject deserved, this Rule would never have seen the light of day, and many hard working public servants would have been spared the innumerable heart-burnings and well-nigh insupportable worry and anxiety which it brought in its train.

Number of Teachers Affected.

Early in December, 1912, Mr. Birrell replied as follows, in the House of Commons, to Mr. Hackett, M.P.:—

"The Commissioners of National Education inform me that salary amounting in all to about £900 was withheld from 182 married women teachers, because they could not provide substitutes, as required by Rule 52 (f). Two hundred and eighty-seven employed and paid substitutes.

THOMAS J. O'CONNELL.

Delays in Issuing Reports.

In order to find out what time generally elapses between the date of annual inspection and the issuing of a "Report" to the teacher, the Mullingar Teachers' Association sent the following document to those of its members who are principal teachers:—

(COPY)

Name of School

Roll No.

County

Year.	Date of General Inspection.	Date on which Report was issued from Education Office.	State whether Report was raised, lowered or unchanged.
1908 ..			
1909 ..			
1910 ..			
1911 ..			
1912 ..			
1913 ..			

I certify above return to be correct.

Signed Principal Teacher.

Date September, 1913.

N.B.—Please return above, duly signed, to Thomas Murray, Rathway B.S., Killycass, on or before Saturday, 6th September, 1913.

Many of the teachers were on holidays when this was sent out, and only about thirty returns were sent in by the date mentioned. The following extracts from these returns are deserving of notice:—

Roll No.	Date of General Inspection.	Date on which Report was issued.	Number of days.	Notes of Report.
0040	1/22/06	4/1/06	34	Lowered
	25/11/01	5/1/10	24	Unchanged.
1305	4/12/12	16/1/13	45	Unchanged.
0015	25/1/06	2/5/06	24	Unchanged.
0015	1/10/06	4/12/06	178	Unchanged.
14263	22/1/06	9/5/06	47	Unchanged.
	14/2/11	22/2/12	34	Unchanged.
13493	11/10/06	26/7/06	47	Unchanged.
	24/1/11	4/6/12	41	Unchanged.
7644	20/9/12	No report issued.	—	—
	16/10/11	15/12/11	62	—
12408	4/10/06	3/1/06	31	Unchanged.
	11/12/11	6/1/12	25	Lowered.
1514	8/8/06	8/8/06	62	Unchanged.
0040	5/5/06	1/3/06	41	Unchanged.
1218	7/5/12	14/5/12	34	Unchanged.
0430	8/2/06	15/5/06	71	Unchanged.
	11/1/06	2/7/06	23	Unchanged.
0009	14/6/06	25/6/06	62	Unchanged.
0043	24/8/06	2/7/06	42	Unchanged.
	14/8/06	26/7/06	42	Unchanged.
	28/3/03	21/5/10	62	Unchanged.
5884	26/6/11	4/8/11	44	Lowered.
	26/6/12	10/8/12	44	Unchanged.
7721	26/6/12	7/5/10	62	Unchanged.
16047	20/2/12	20/2/12	124	Unchanged.
7943	21/3/06	20/3/06	24	Unchanged.
	6/5/12	15/5/12	62	Unchanged.
	14/3/11	11/6/11	62	Unchanged.
5438	11/2/06	9/5/06	62	Unchanged.
0430	20/1/11	14/5/11	140	Unchanged.

From this extract, it will be noticed that in 30 cases selected from 20 schools, the average time which elapsed between the date of inspection and the issuing of the Minute to the teacher was over nine weeks. It will be readily understood that such delays would have an important bearing on the success of an appeal against the inspector's marking of a school.

THOMAS J. O'CONNELL.

RULE 127(b).

Statement on Rule 127(b) adopted by the Central Executive Committee of the Irish National Teachers' Organisation, 1910.

N.B.—This statement is intended to show how teachers of schools in which Rule 127(b) is enforced, suffer in salary and status, and has nothing to do with the consideration of the Rule on its merits.

Rule 127(b) which states that, "Boys under seven years of age are ineligible for enrolment in a Boys' School where there is not a mistress," was introduced in 1905, and is now enforced in a large number of schools in the country. In every case in which this rule has been put into operation, a serious injury has been inflicted on the teacher concerned. In fact, it is impossible under present regulations, to enforce the rule (except on the occurrence of a vacancy) without at the same time causing a monetary loss to the teacher of the school in which it is enforced.

It is a well known and oft deplored fact that our Irish boys leave school too early. The normal age is fourteen years, and in rural schools they leave much earlier. If then we take any ordinary school in Ireland—a rural school especially (and Ireland is a country of rural schools), we find that the number of boys under seven years of age will be, in almost every case, one-third of those in average attendance. I suppose that that 127(b) is put into operation in any given school, it means the reduction of the average of that school by one-third. And what does this mean for the teacher? It means, first, the annual loss of a third part of his capitation payment.

Secondly, it may, and very often does, mean a loss of increment or promotion to a higher grade; and, thirdly, it may mean a reduction of his grade salary.*

To illustrate, let us take the case of a boys' school having an average attendance of, say, 30 pupils. The teacher of such a school, may, if efficient, reach the maximum salary of second grade: that is, £114 plus £10s. capitation. If Rule 127(b) is introduced, his average attendance falls to 20. Now, being a teacher of a school under 30 average, he cannot, according to Rule 104(b) be promoted to second grade, or receive increment in that grade, supposing him to be already promoted.

But this is not the worst. We know how uncertain is the attendance at our rural schools, and how easily affected it is by epidemics, severe weather, farming operations, &c., and as likely as not the average of the school may drop a point or two and fall below 20. What happens? The teacher's salary is immediately reduced from perhaps £107 to £50,* or if he hasn't had the good fortune to be appointed before April, 1905, he is paid the princely sum of £44 per annum.

An instance of where this has happened is within the writer's cognisance, and it may be useful to give details. The average at this particular school for year ended 31/12/06, was 19. The average number of boys under seven years in attendance at the adjoining girls' school for same period (and who, it may be presumed, would, were it not for Rule 127(b) be attending his) was 10. The teacher's grade salary was £70—so lately as December, 1905, he had got an increment of good service salary. But as the average for the year 1905 was below 20, his salary was reduced on January 1st, 1910, to £44—that is by £26 or exactly 10s. per week.

And yet, Mr. Birrell replying to Mr. O'Brien (for Mr. Hayden) in the House of Commons, so late as the middle of June (1910) was made to say: "There have been no cases in which teachers' salaries have been reduced owing to fall in average attendance due to the operation of Rule 127(b)."

There is one feature in connection with the enforcement of this rule which is not generally known, but which serves to accentuate the hardships which such enforcement inflicts. In very many cases where the Board insists on enforcing 127(b) in opposition to the wishes of the manager, the latter refuses to allow the boys under seven to go to the adjoining girls' school. These children continue to attend the boys' school, but as they cannot be enrolled, their attendances cannot be taken into account when reckoning the average attendance, and no capitation is paid on them; and it often happens that a teacher finds himself denied promotion or increment owing to insufficient average, while if these boys under seven whom he has to admit and teach but cannot count, were taken into calculation, the average would be more than sufficient to warrant promotion or increment.

We are slow to think that the Commissioners who on a memorable occasion voted against the amendment which sought to exempt from the operation of the rule, during the existing teacher's tenure of office, any school upon which its effect would be to reduce the salary of an existing teacher, ever dreamt of the extent to which injustice under this rule could go; and now that experience has shown them that in no case can this rule be enforced without inflicting injustice, often very serious, on existing teachers, we hope that they will at once revise their decision on this very important amendment. Should they do this and act up to the spirit as well as the letter of the amendment then as teacher, our opposition to Rule 127(b) shall cease. With regard to those cases in which 127(b) is at present in operation, our demands may be thus briefly summarised.

We ask:—

(1) That no teacher's salary be reduced owing to insufficient average resulting from the operation of Rule 127(b).

*The present footnote to the Rule, viz.—"The Commissioners waive this rule where the existing grade salary of a teacher would be reduced in consequence of its application" did not then appear in the "Code."

†The instance here quoted refers to my own particular case. I was paid at the rate of £44 per annum during the year 1910—my salary having been reduced from £70. The balance was, however, refunded to me in January, 1911.

(2) That no teacher be deprived of the promotion or increment to which, but for the operation of this rule he would be entitled.

(3) That compensation be given to teachers for loss of capitation incurred through the operation of the rule.

(4) That (1), (2), and (3) be retrospective.

We wish to make it plain that we make these demands only on behalf of existing teachers, and we ask for their continuance only during the tenure of such existing teachers." By existing teachers we mean those who held their appointments when Rule 127(b) was enforced in their schools.

We beg on behalf of the teachers affected by this rule to formally put forward the foregoing demands, and we trust that in the interests of equity and fair play, the Commissioners will concede the very reasonable claims which are made therein."

Undoubtedly the most serious consideration in connection with the administration of this rule is, that through its operation, hundreds, perhaps thousands of grant-receiving children are not on the rolls of any school, and the annual capitation grant of 5s. which the Treasury would be willing to pay for those children, is lost to the teachers and the country; and in the event of "Home Rule" coming into operation, will be permanently lost.

It seems rather paradoxical that while the Board complains bitterly of the paucity of Treasury grants, it persists in enforcing this rule against the wishes of managers though it is aware that the only effects will be simply to remove the names of a number of children from the rolls, and deprive the teacher, who is used as a buffer between the Board and the manager, of his capitation grant and often of his promotion and increment.

THOMAS J. O'CONNELL.

Rules to Admit Visitors to National Schools.

Rules 9 and 11 are open to considerable abuse especially in the case of girls' schools, and should be considerably modified. I append a letter which appeared in the *Irish Independent* of February 25th, 1913, in which the main objections to these rules are set forth, and some suggestions made for their amendment.

Visitors to National Schools.

"Sir—The trouble which has arisen owing to the suspicious action of a visitor in some city schools during the past week is, I believe, in a large measure due to the archaic regulations of the National Board regarding the admissions of visitors to national schools. These regulations have on many occasions proved a fruitful source of worry and annoyance to teachers, but it is only when an incident like that of last week occurs and public attention is rivetted on the matter that we come to recognise that the interests of pupils and parents are also seriously affected.

"The following are some extracts from the Commissioners' "code" bearing on the matter:—

"Rule 9.—Visitors of all denominations have free access to the schoolrooms during the hours devoted to secular instruction, and have full liberty to examine the religious instruction certificate book, daily report book, and rolls."

"Rule 11(a).—Every teacher is required to receive courteously visitors of all denominations, and, if requested to produce for their inspection such of the school records as visitors are permitted to examine (i.e., the report book, roll book, and religious certificate book). (b).—Visitors may enter such remarks as they deem fit in the daily report book, and these remarks must not be altered or erased."

"The regulations make no distinction whatsoever as to the class or condition of the visitors to be admitted, and give the teacher no option to use his discretion as to whom he shall, or should not, admit. Consequently every 'Weary Willie' who passes the road has the right to enter the national school, order the teacher (who must receive him

consequently) to produce the school account books for his inspection, and is at liberty 'to enter such remarks as he deems fit, in the daily report book'; and no matter what the nature of these remarks—they may reflect seriously on the character or appearance of the teachers, they may be the innuendo outpourings of a spirit 'too full for words,' they may possibly even risk of blasphemy or immorality—still they 'must not be altered or erased.'

"I have in my mind a particular case in which this privilege, so indiscriminately conceded to visitors, was availed of to enter in the report book of a certain school what, in my opinion, were libellous statements regarding the teachers of the school. The matter was investigated, the charges contained in these statements could not be substantiated, yet the entry is allowed to remain, and though it reflects seriously on the character of the teachers, they 'must not alter or erase it.'

"Again, inspectors, organisers, or other officials of the Board on entering a school, even for the first time, do not produce, and are not bound (so far as I know) to produce, any symbol of authority from the Board to show that 'they are, who they are.' Though they may be wholly unknown to the teacher, he must either take their word, or know by intuition, that they are officials of the Board, and produce all school accounts and records, public and private, for their inspection. This has led to another abuse which has often been exposed in your columns—I refer to the hoaxing of teachers by pseudo inspectors, who visit schools and hold bogus examinations of pupils and school records."

"I venture to offer the following suggestions as a remedy for the present unsatisfactory regulations:—

"(1) That no person should have the right to enter a national school, except on production of a written authority signed by the Secretaries of the National Board or by the Manager of the school."

"(2) That such authorised persons should, on entering the school, produce this authority if asked to do so by the principal teacher. (Officials on entering a school for the first time or when they are not personally acquainted with the teacher should, as a matter of courtesy, produce their authority without putting on the teacher the necessity of asking for it.)"

"(3) That teachers be at liberty to admit other visitors at their own discretion, and on the understanding that they do so wholly on their own responsibility."

"It is to be hoped that recent happenings will cause the Commissioners to revise their rules relating to the admission of visitors to schools. As they stand at present they are alike subversive to the interests of teachers, pupils and educational efficiency."

"T. J. O'CONNELL.

"Streamstown, Co. Westmeath,
February 24th, 1913."

The following "Practical Rules" were evidently framed in a spirit of distrust of the teacher, and should be omitted from the "Code":—

Practical Rule II(c); II(A); the latter portion of IV(b); IV(c).

The presence of these regulations denotes that the teacher is still regarded with suspicion by the educational authorities.

THOMAS J. O'CONNELL.

Promotions, Salaries, &c.

The effect of the new system of grading and promotion has been to lower considerably the salaries of teachers appointed for the first time under that system. Before 1900, it was quite a common thing to find the principal of a school with an average attendance of 40 pupils in the first division of First Class—having an income of £120 to £140 a year, after ten or twelve years' service. The cost of living having in the meantime increased by almost 50 per cent., the present equivalent of these figures would be £

salary of from \$140 to \$180. But under the new system the teacher of such a school after ten or twelve years' service may count himself fortunate if he has attained the maximum of third grade, with a salary of scarcely more than half these amounts.

A "living wage" is generally understood to mean that which enables a man after a certain reasonable time to marry and bring up a family in the position in society which the community expects him to occupy. Judged by this standard, a teacher is not at present paid "a living wage." Hence the difficulty in getting young men of ability to go in for teaching at the present time; and the few of those who do go to the Colleges only go in order to procure a cheap education which will enable them after, perhaps, a year or two spent in teaching, to turn their attention to better paid pursuits; or they wait till they receive their Teaching Diplomas and then depart to England, Scotland or the Colonies, where their services are more highly valued and rewarded than at their own country. In this connection it has been suggested (Questions, 1788-1800) that there is no dearth of men candidates for training. St. Patrick's College was specially mentioned, and it was stated that more than three hundred in first division had a chance of being called. A neighbour of mine who found himself among the last dozen of successful candidates at the Junior Examination has been called to St. Patrick's for the current session. Early in June of this year, Mr. Ginnell, M.P., questioned Mr. Burrell, in the House of Commons, as to the number who applied for training in this College for the session 1912-13; how many of these passed the King's Scholarship Examination, and how many were subsequently called to training. In his reply, Mr. Burrell stated that 160 applicants were proposed to the College authorities for examination. Of this number, 90 qualified, and 84 were admitted. Ninety-

nine candidates for 84 places does not seem to indicate very keen competition.

If progress is to be made in education, the salaries of the teachers must be considerably increased, and no shuffling of the present grade or simple alteration of the method of paying increments, such as that suggested by his Lordship, Dr. Kelly, will have any useful effect. It is not so much the smallness of the initial salary that teachers find fault with, as the numerous and practically insurmountable barriers which are placed in the way of rapid promotion.

Teachers in Small Schools.

Question 5256 suggests that the general principle of paying a person "in a small position dealing with a small number of people" at a lower rate than the man who has to deal with a large number of people ought to apply in the case of teachers of small schools.

It must, however, be remembered that persons to whom this principle applies—say postmen or station masters—can be, and are, advanced from the small positions to the larger ones as part of their regular promotion. In the case of a teacher this does not hold. He is not, as a matter of course, placed in charge of a big school after serving a certain time in a small one, and it is questionable whether such a course would be advisable even if feasible, for, seeing that the State is entirely or almost entirely responsible for the salary of the teacher, the child in the rural district has as much right to the services of a highly qualified and experienced teacher as his brethren in the more populous areas.

It is therefore manifestly unjust to apply this principle in fixing the salary of the teacher of a small school.

THOMAS J. O'CONNELL.

APPENDIX LIX.

(Based in by Miss U. M. Nolan, President, I.N.T.O., furnished by Mr. James M. Feaighly, C.E.C., I.N.T.O., Ashboon N.S., Aidjort, Co. Kerry).

I shall have completed thirty years' service as national teacher in November, this year (1913).

I have been a member of the Irish National Teachers' Organisation during those thirty years.

As *prima facie* evidence that I enjoy in a large measure the respect and confidence of my fellow teachers—particularly in the counties of Kerry, Clare and Limerick—I respectfully submit that I have been from time to time Chairman of our local Association in Tralee; Chairman for two years of the County Kerry Teachers' Association; and am now, and have been for the past four years, District Representative for the counties Kerry, Clare, and Limerick, on our Central Executive Committee—all these honours are by ballot. Mixing much with, and having frequent opportunities of consultation with the teachers of those counties, I have very little hesitation in asserting that I have never experienced so much discontent with the present system of national education as I have noticed during the past few years. This has been particularly the case over large portions of Kerry and Clare. In Limerick, I am bound in fairness to say there has been comparatively little discontent, owing largely to the fact that the inspectors in that county have been—and I trust still are—gentlemen in whom the teachers have much confidence—they are Messrs. McNall (now chief inspector) and MacMahon.

I regret to say I have a different tale to tell of Clare. For years back and until recently, the Clare teachers had to deal with an inspector whom they regarded as able, broad-minded, sympathetic and just Mr. M. O'Sullivan. They had heard—that was well known in Kerry—that in his younger days the fame of "Michael O'Sullivan" as principal teacher of Prince National School was not confined to his native Kerry, and they believed further that they had in Mr. O'Sullivan an inspector able to appreciate their difficulties, and ever ready to advise and assist them whenever advice or assistance was necessary.

No wonder the Clare teachers worked hard to gain and retain the confidence of this gentleman they loved so well. Incidentally I may remark that on Mr. O'Sullivan's retirement, the Clare teachers presented him with an illuminated address and a purse of sovereigns—a small tribute to his worth as an inspector and as a man. Then soon after the happy relations between teacher and inspector were arrested, for two junior inspectors commenced to lower the reports wholesale, so much so, that one would be almost tempted to conclude this was their only mission. Apparently they didn't seem to care whether it was district inspector or senior inspector gave the good report; or whether the lowered report interfered with the teacher's character, his increment, or his promotion. So much did these teachers of Clare then feel the treatment to which they were subjected, that at a meeting of the West Clare Teachers' Association, on the 23rd April, 1910, the following resolution was passed unanimously—30 teachers present:—

"(a) We beg to bring under the notice of the Commissioners of National Education that grave dissatisfaction exists in our district at the conduct of a young junior inspector, Mr. Cole, who was recently doing duty here, and who in almost every instance reduced in the schools inspected by him, the reports of previous senior and district inspectors—educational experts of the highest reputation; (b) that we regard the lowering of the reports of previous inspectors as detrimental to the best interests of education, and calculated only to dishearten teachers and retard their honest efforts to advance the interests of their pupils; (c) that we consider the standard of examination adopted by Mr. Cole, in his examination of evening schools in this district, much too high, and calculated to discourage the continuance of these schools. His questions as book-keeping—a popular subject in evening schools—were in some cases as difficult

as these set out at the King's Scholarship Examination."

The foregoing resolution was endorsed at a meeting of the North Clare and Midtown Malbay Teachers' Association on the 30th April, 1919.

In addition to the above, and in consequence of repeated complaints from the teachers concerned, the Central Executive Committee of the Irish National Teachers' Organisation passed unanimously the following resolution on the 27th August, 1919:—

(Cont.)

"That from reports received by this Committee from West Clare and Tipperary Teachers' Associations relative to the method by which Mr. Cole discharged his duties as inspector of schools, we deem it our duty in the interests of education, as well as in the interests of the teachers concerned, to request the Commissioners of National Education to hold an inquiry to ascertain if the complaints made against the inspector named are, or are not just."

Prepared—Mr. O'Callaghan, V.P., I.N.T.O.

Secunder—Mr. Feighly, Dist. 4 Rep.

Now, I respectfully submit that the three resolutions I have quoted show—if anything can—that much and serious discontent with the present inspector system—as carried out in Clare—has obtained there, until very recently, if not yet. But, perhaps it is necessary I should first of all show some justification of these resolutions, and this I propose doing, under the following heads:—(1) Want of Uniformity; (2) Lowering of Report in Increment or Promotion Year; (3) Discourtesy; (4) Observations. In most cases I shall quote the Roll No. rather than the name of school; but in some cases I haven't got the Roll No., and only then shall I give name of school. I propose to submit only about twenty "cases" from Clare, although I have "notes" of a much larger number. In every case the teacher has vouched for the accuracy of statement to me. In Kerry—my own county—I cannot say that there has been so much discontent, particularly since the removal of Mr. Wely from a part of the circuit where he was far from being respected. I know the teachers of whom he worked, as well—if not better—than any other teacher—I am their representative on the Central Executive Committee of the Irish National Teachers' Organisation, and this fact establishes between them and me, relations not ordinarily found existing between teachers spread over a wide area. Many of them have, from time to time, asked my opinion or advice on matters incidental to their calling, and we often discussed inspectors as to their manners and their methods. Everything considered, I have no reason to believe those teachers spoke otherwise than what they believed, to me, and from what they did say, I have no hesitation in concluding that Mr. Wely was most unpopular among them, and that when he was removed, a load was lifted off many a teacher's heart. In my own part of the Kerry Circuit, I have had experience of about a dozen inspectors in the past twenty-six years, and, on the whole, must say their relations with me have been very satisfactory. Three of them, on three different occasions, gave me much room for complaint. I state the facts, and am prepared to furnish names, if called on to do so.

No. (1).—The latest gentleman I ever knew, did almost nothing all the time he spent in the school but sit at the teacher's rostrum, and give directions from there. Some subjects he neither inspected nor examined, and yet he assigned marks to all, and lowered the merit mark from "Good" to "Fair."

No. (2).—Inspector both examined and inspected on the opening day after long Summer Holidays, with only seventeen pupils present, and lowered the merit mark from "Good" to "Fair." Here is his minute: "The work is too deliberate, and the boys are slow in thought and speech. The first endeavour of the master should be to rouse them to quicker habits.—15th September, 1905." I may add that these are the only occasions my school was marked "Fair." No. (1) complained of the discipline in my school, although every inspector for thirteen years previously—that is from the school's first opening, spoke highly of the discipline, tone, &c. I have always paid much attention to discipline, tone, &c. No in-

spector ever spoke otherwise than in terms of praise on this matter.

No. (3).—Inspector is, I am convinced, a very able gentleman, as well as being an excellent judge of the work and worth of a teacher, and were it not that he is a bit testy and easily put out of humour, I know no other I should prefer to inspect or examine my school. I must have been particularly unfortunate on the occasion of his first visit. He came for the Annual, and arrived at the school about 8.20 a.m. School was opened, and fire laid since 9 o'clock. After some minutes, and in his presence, I wound up and set at 9.30 the school clock that had run down during the previous night. He snappily told me it was now 9.35. I agreed, though surprised why he didn't address me in a different tone of voice. After five or six minutes, he inquired still more sharply: "How long more is the fire to remain like that?" Now, I was displeased, and said, "I can't say, sir, but I believe 'till be a good fire soon." His manner to me became positively peevish. After school work had gone on for an hour or thereabouts, he asked my opinion of the penmanship of a boy. I gave it as fairly as I could. He remarked with a sneer, "Oh! indeed! I see! so that's what you think, indeed!" Something similar happened when he asked, and I gave my opinion about a particular drawing. A third time he asked my opinion on the reading of a boy. I gave it, and he acted as before. By this time, I was in a fair way of losing my temper, but tried to restrain myself, for on the next occasion he asked my opinion on a matter. I said, "I respectfully decline, sir, to give you my opinion"; and when he asked, "Why?" I told him it was because of the manner he had treated my opinion I had already given on other matters. A short time before he had finished in my school, we differed regarding the interpretation of one of the Commissioners' Rules. He openly, in presence of the pupils, lost his temper, slammed the "Book of Rules" on the desk, and said quite aloud: "I have a constitutional objection to discuss the matter further with you." A few days afterwards, I persuaded the manager of the school to inquire of the Board which of us was right. He did so, and I now produce the type-written document sent by them, which shows he was wrong. My miserable day with No. 3 gentleman arose from his nasty temper which got the better of him sometimes. Had I agreed with him in everything during the early part of the day, I believe (from what I learned about him afterwards) things would have gone on much more smoothly, and my time would have been a much pleasanter one than it was on this occasion. This inspector was over after most kind to me, and overlooked many of my shortcomings.

Other Kerry teachers have suffered greatly more than I have, in proof of which I beg to submit 15 cases from the county, selected from a much larger number sent me, and dealing mostly with Mr. Wely's part of the circuit. They (cases) indicate a tendency towards lowering report on school when increment or promotion was due to the teacher. Two of them complain of enforced inefficiency, and three of rudeness and discourtesy on the part of the inspector. I submit as "case" from Limerick, as the inspectors there give very little ground for complaint—at least so far as the evidence in my possession shows.

Now, though I fear my statement has stretched out to undue length, I am anxious to refer to a few other matters, and to make some suggestions.

Let Mr. Dilworth, in answer to questions 674, 675, and 676 in the first volume of evidence, tried to show that there was no undue delay in sending down the mark a school has received. He mentioned ten days, then the normal time as a fortnight or three weeks, and in very rare cases a month or two. This is an experience I had lately. The Annual was held on the 15th February, 1912, and the report and mark were sent out of the Office on 22nd October, 1912—that is more than eight months after. Mr. McNeill, in answer to question 1836, same volume, attributes the unusual delay sometimes to incorrect returns sent in by teachers. There was no mistake in returns sent in by me, and no rectification was necessary. I know another case where mark took eight months to come—in the same year. I produce official proof. A worse case than this happened in my own experience recently. An official document relating to Annual reached me fifteen months after—I produce official proof of this also. So much for the sending out of important official documents.

2nd. Mr. McNeill, in answer to questions 1333, 1334, 1337, 1338, and 1339; and Mr. Bonaparte Wyse, in answer to questions 2109 and 2110, endeavored to show that there was a tendency to leniency in the increment year. I answer that many of the cases I submit from two counties only show a tendency in the opposite direction.

3rd. On the question of appeals, Mr. McNeill, in answer to question 1983, would not admit that the smallness of the number of appeals is due to want of confidence in the appeal, or in the person to be appealed to, but holds that if proper procedure is adopted, the teacher recognizes that the lowering of the mark is inevitable; and that the teacher recognizes the reasonableness of it. I don't know where he got the teachers' confidence sufficiently to convince him of what he states; but I do know that in my experience, teachers do not appeal; (a) because they have no confidence in the authority to be appealed to; (b) in many cases they have no idea who hears the appeal; (c) they have heard some cases where an appeal was unsuccessful; (d) they seldom hear of a successful appeal, and (e) being very human they conclude that it is better to bear their troubles a little while yet, than perhaps incur the displeasure of the party whose action gave them some grounds for feeling aggrieved.

In answer to question 1901—"You say if the confidence was increased, the number of appeals might increase too?" Answer, "Yes," I agree, but would wish to add—If the confidence is diminished, the number of appeals is most likely to diminish also—a shallow burial of discontent.

4th. In answer to questions 2327 and 2328, Mr. Bonaparte Wyse tries to show that whenever a school is inspected at unreasonable times, the inspector always makes due allowance—in fact sometimes gives a higher mark than was deserved. Let us give him my own experience. My school was inspected on the opening day after long Summer holidays. Less than half the pupils were present. In consequence of no amusement from "the night" on previous Sunday, and mark was lowered. Here is the minute: "The work is too deliberate, and the boys are slow in thought and speech. The first endeavor of the master should be to rouse them to quicker habits—12/9/05." Not another word, except the word "Fair" on top of page.

(TARE CASES).

(1) Roll No. of School, 9399.

Seven years of highly efficient service would be completed in 1904. Report then lowered to "Fair." In 1909, Mr. McNeill, then Senior—now Chief Inspector—gave the mark "V.G." In 1910, Mr. Hollins, Junior, lowered Senior's "V.G." to "Good." The Senior, in 1908, observes: "Methods of both teachers are skilful." In 1910, Junior complains of teaching methods. In 1911, same Junior observes: "Teachers are capable and diligent, and endeavour to discharge their duties carefully."

(2) Roll No. of School, 14757.

Year.	Inspector.	Mark.
1907	Mr. Murphy (Sen.)	Excellent
1908	Mr. O'Sullivan (Dist.)	Excellent
1909	Mr. O'Sullivan	Excellent
1910	Mr. O'Sullivan	Excellent
13 July 1911	Mr. Hollins (Junior)	V.G.
2 Nov., 1911	Mr. McNeill (Senior)	Excellent
9 July, 1912	Mr. Lynnam	Excellent

In 1903, Mr. Young gave "Excellent" at Annual; in 1904, mark lowered to "Good" by Mr. O'Sullivan. Promotion due—not granted.

(3) Roll No. of School, 14323.

At annual inspection, September, 1908, Mr. McNeill gave the mark "V.G." and wrote in Observation Book:—"This school continues to advance steadily, and its present condition is creditable to the teachers. Pupils neat and orderly, and attentive to their work." In 1910, on 1st February, Mr. Cole, Junior, complains of almost everything, even those praised by Senior. In 1911, another Junior raised the mark to "V.G."

(4) Roll No. of School, 13442.

In 1909, Mr. McNeill gave school "V.G.", and wrote in minute:—"Teaching is energetic and effective, and the state of the school is creditable to the Misses Fitzpatrick and Flaherty." Observation Book:—"Room well kept." Just four months afterwards, at Incidental, Mr. Cole, Junior, complained of almost everything, and wrote in Observation Book:—"Children outside loitering when I arrived (9.45). Teachers and pupils came to doors and windows to look out on my arrival. Only 33 present. Co-operates badly with boy's."

(5) Roll No. 14322.

Reports "Good" followed by "V.G." till 1909. 2nd February, 1909, Mr. O'Sullivan gave "V.G.", and wrote in Observation Book:—"School maintains its usual standard of efficiency. Mental arithmetic receiving special attention." 23/9/09, Mr. McNeill lowered previous "V.G." to "Fair." His first visit. School was at the time undergoing repairs. In 1911, Mr. Hollins raised Senior's "Fair" to "Good." On 7th July, 1911, Mr. Hollins complained of finding children on the way to school at 10.15 a.m. Roll call from 10.20 to 10.30.

(6) Roll No. 13418.

Six successive reports "V.G." to 1910. In 1910, Mr. Cole lowered mark to "Good." In 1911, Mr. Hollins gave "Good." In 1912, Mr. Lynnam gave "Good," and minute very satisfactory without a single complaint on any head, yet could not raise the mark above "Good."

(7) Roll No. 14331.

In 1910, Mr. McNeill gave "V.G." at annual inspection, and his remarks were highly satisfactory. Not a single fault found. On 15th November, 1911,—Mr. Hollins, at an Incidental, wrote in Observation Book:—"Punctuality is not sufficiently good. Teacher entered school at 9.30, and girls coming in all 10 o'clock." School was open since 9 o'clock, and everything was in order. At same visit, he wrote:—"Written work is from 'V.G.' to 'Excellent.' This school had four Incidental visits from 9.20 to 9.30, during 1912, from Mr. Hollins. At last one, he observed:—"Both teachers and a number of pupils present when I arrived. Fires lighted, and rooms neat and clean. Several pupils still come late." Teacher says she believes Espionage is apparent.

(8) Roll No. 12273.

22/12/1911—Mr. Hollins lowered previous mark "V.G." to "Good," and this was his first visit to the school.

(8a) Roll No. 3000.

"Good" reports up to 1907. On 15th February, 1907, Senior lowered mark to "Fair." Promotion was then due, and teacher knows no reason why mark was lowered, except this. "Goods" from this on to 1911, when Mr. Hollins lowered mark to "Fair" on first visit.

(9) Roll No. 13419.

All records from appointment in 1893 to 1904 "Excellent." Got Certificate and Blake Premium in 1898. In 1904, Mr. Dalen, Senior, gave the mark "Excellent." In 1905, same inspector lowered this mark to "V.G." though he remarks in Observation Book:—"This school continues to be admirably conducted in every respect." "V.G." is the highest mark obtained since, though reports continue very flattering. In 1910, Mr. McNeill, Senior, gave "V.G.", and wrote:—"This is a well taught school, and its present condition is highly creditable to the teachers. Schoolroom neatly kept, and general proficiency highly satisfactory."

(10) Roll No. 15409.

Mark prior to 1910, "V.G." In 1910, 10th May, Mr. McNeill, Senior, gave the mark "V.G.", and observed:—"This is a thoroughly well taught school. The teachers are capable, and the pupils are intelligent and interested in their work." About 3½ months afterwards, Mr. Cole reduced the Senior's "V.G." to "Good," and wrote:—"The proficiency of the pupils attending this school is by no means up to the stand-

and attained by them in former years." In 1910, Mr. Hollins gave "Good," and observed:—"Though the school continues to make good progress, it cannot be said to have attained its former high level of efficiency despite the industry and earnestness of the teachers."

1st Visit.—How did Mr. Cole or Mr. Hollins know "former high level of efficiency?"

(11) Roll No. 12633.

Reports for 1902, 1903 and 1904 "Good"; for 1905, 1906, 1907 and 1908 were "VG"; for 1909 and 1910 "Good." Then Mr. Hollins, in 1911, lowered mark to "Fair," and gave "Fair," 1912 also. The teacher never got less than a "Good" report during past thirty-five years till Mr. Hollins came. Then everything went according to him—discipline, tone, &c. Mr. Hollins only asked the following question on subject matter to explain "And then Liberty! the attributes of the Gods." Boys didn't explain, and Inspector said "they knew nothing of the subject matter of lesson." Teacher got full fees for Irish in 1909 and 1910. In consequence of mark "Fair" by Mr. Hollins, in 1911, only got 25 fees out of £30. Teacher had to discontinue teaching Irish in consequence of the 1911 "Fair." Discipline, &c., always good till the advent of Mr. Hollins—had since.

(12) Roll No. 7003.

From 1904 to 1909 inclusive, six "Goods" from Messrs. McNeill, O'Sullivan and Dalton. In 1910, Mr. Cole lowered mark to "Fair." In 1911, Mr. Cole gave only "Fair," and in 1912, Mr. Hollins gave only "Fair." Complaints of rudeness of an inspector to whom he handed a chair. Inspector kicked the chair away in presence of pupils, and at another time said: "I know what you are at here." Cookery was forced on this school though building is most unsuitable, and equipment and material are provided by teacher's wife.

(13) Roll No. 11534.

Every inspector (including Mr. Dalton, four times; Mr. O'Sullivan, twice; and Mr. Murphy, Senior, once) from 1900 to 1909 inclusive, gave "Good." In 1910, Mr. Cole lowered mark to "Fair." In 1911, he gave "Good," and in 1912, Mr. Hogan, Senior, gave "VG." Cookery is taught, and equipment was paid for by the assistant. Teacher considers he has suffered a loss of £30 in increments, and £200 through being undergraded.

(14) Roll No. 10321.

In October, 1906, Mr. O'Sullivan gave "Good." In September, 1907, Mr. O'Sullivan gave "VG." In October, 1908, Mr. McNeill gave "Fair." Increment was due on 1st April, 1909, and though Mr. McNeill lowered mark two steps, he promised he would recommend increment. Manager wrote several times to Board, but no increment came until after examination in 1910, and was then made to date from October, 1909, instead of from April, 1909.

(15) Roll No. 10417.

From 1907 to 1910, inclusive, the mark "Excellent" was given without a break. Then Mr. Hollins came in 1911, and lowered mark to "Good."

(16) Roll No. 3497.

In 1902, Mr. Mullany gave "Excellent." In 1903, Mr. Newell gave "Fair." In 1904, Mr. Hanna gave "Good."

(17) Roll No. 4327.

In 1902, Mr. Mullany gave "Excellent." In 1903, Mr. Newell gave "Fair." In 1904, Mr. Hanna gave "Good."

(18.) Roll No. 13379.

In 1906, 1907, and 1908, Mr. O'Sullivan gave "Good," "Good," and "VG." In 1909, Mr. Dalton gave "Good." In 1910, Mr. Mahon gave "Fair."

In 1911, Mr. Kelly gave "Good," and in 1912, Mr. Kelly gave "Fair." Increment was delayed a year in consequence of the "Fair" at end of triennial period.

(19) Roll Nos. 11813 and 11814.

On 24th March, 1903, Mr. Newell examined both schools. At boys' school, seven "Goods" and one "Fair" obtained the merit mark "Good." At girls' school, five "Goods" and four "Fairs" obtained the merit mark "VG." In 1912, Mr. Hollins stated in his report on boys' school:—"A higher standard of proficiency is to be looked for in History, Reading and Explanation, and Spelling." Teacher says he never tested the boys in History. Teacher presented pupils of both schools in Irish, and was paid for gals only, though Mr. Hollins says he recommended fees for boys also.

(20) Roll No. 12907.

Teacher got increment of £1 in 1903. He got "VG." for years 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907 and 1908. Senior lowered report to "Good" in 1909, and Junior raised it "VG." in 1910. Removed to another school on 1st July, 1910, and raised his predecessor's "Middling" to "VG." in one year. Teacher has only got £1 in fifteen years, though in that period he has obtained nine "VG.'s" and estimates his loss at £122.

(KERRY CASES).

(1.) Roll No. 3184.

In 1900, 1901, 1902 and 1903, "Good" in school Roll No. 31018. In 1904 and 1905, "VG." in same school. In 1906, teacher worked very hard to get a third "VG." in order to get promotion, but mark was then lowered to "Good." In 1908, at an incidental visit, Inspector called teacher outside, and told him he'd only give "Fair" at next Annual. He kept his word.

At Annual, in 1901, teacher got "VG." for several subjects; "Excellent" for two, and "Fair" for one, yet merit mark assigned was only "Good." Should have been "VG."

(2.) Knocknashewe Girls'.

1901 and 1903. Teacher got "Excellent." From 1903 to 1910, teacher got eight "Goods," and one "Very Good." In 1911, teacher got only "Fair" from Mr. Daly, Senior, and in 1912, "Fair" from Mr. Lehan, District Inspector, who said he could not raise the 1912 report after the Senior (Mr. Daly). Teacher asserts Mr. Daly's manner was most discourteous to her, and maintains he has animus towards her in consequence of trouble between her husband and Mr. Welpy.

(3.) Brown Boys', formerly Scarrigallen Boys'.

From 1900 to 1906, teacher got "Excellent" or "VG." In May, 1907, Mr. Welpy lowered the merit mark to "Good." Teacher says of Mr. Welpy on this occasion:—"His demeanour to me was rude. He never noticed a single remark made by me, but examined in the old Results style, and filled pages of Observation Book which I didn't see till he had left." This teacher got the Carlake and Blake Premium from Mr. Coyne; was recommended for inspection by Mr. W. O'B. Newell, and has taught successfully for R.U.I. examinations. Serious trouble arose between teacher and Mr. Welpy. Teacher wrote a letter which had much to do with his removal to a considerable distance from his old school.

(4.) Knocknagree Girls' School.

Reports 1903, 1904, and 1905 "Good." This was lowered to "Middling" in 1906—increment year—by Mr. Welpy. On the 20th November, 1906, Mr. Welpy called at 8.30—school due to open according to Time-Table at 9 o'clock. Teacher arrived at 8.15. Examination began at 8.25. Teacher says:—"From the beginning, his demeanour to me was aggressive."

overbearing, and entirely devoid of courtesy. Mocking wild and wet. Almost a cruelty to examine children in wet garments after travelling three or four miles through the bogs and glens of Windy Peak. In 1907, Mr. Welply again gave "Addling" after an examination lasting from 8.35 a.m. to 4.30 p.m.

- (3). Castlebridge N.S., formerly Fossa N.S., Kildare.

Reports, Fossa.—"Good" from Mr. Casson, in 1901; "Good" from Mr. Kyle in 1902; "Fair" from Mr. Welply in 1903—increment year. In 1903, Mr. Welply took the girls of this school to the boys' school. He read their letters, &c., aloud; result was the girls became shy, and in the end broke down entirely. Manager complained of this to the Board, who wrote to say they had written Mr. Welply, and that it would not occur again.

- (6). Roll No. 2808.

Circuit inspector examined and passed Algebra class for school year 1908-1909. Time for subject, 3.50 to 6. No other time available for reasons given. Fees earned £4 10s. withheld in consequence of break of 44 hours in December, due to falling light—reasons for this given. One hundred and seventeen lessons were taught and marked, that is 37 over the minimum.

- (7). Roll No. 4759.

Teacher forced to retire in 1902 on report by Messrs. Hynes and Welply. Service, 28 years and 8 months. Pension reduced from £43 to £38. Teacher maintains that he is now after the lapse of seven years mentally and physically fit.

- (8). Roll No. 4786.

Teacher forced to retire in 1902. She writes me. "Then health improved, and everything looking brighter when Mr. Casson came, and ruined all. His manner towards pupils was domineering, and his report is a lying one. Mr. Welply came, and could only confirm Mr. Casson's report. Result—Notice to quit."

- (9). Roll No. 12980.

First Grade increment due 1st April, 1913, but refused, as report was lowered to "Good" by Mr. Daly, Senior, in October, 1912. Four "VG.s" immediately preceding. Teacher asked inspector not to lower the mark. He answered: "Faith, you did it yourself." Reports from 1901—One "Fair," five "Good," and seven "Very Good."

- (10). Roll No. 14083.

Reports from Mr. Welply, for years 1904, 1905, 1906 and 1907 were "Fair," "Fair," "Fair," "Barely Fair," respectively. Teacher was reprimanded, and fined for the "Barely Fair." Teacher appealed, but got no redress. Reports for 1910, 1911 and 1912 are "Good," "Good," and "Good." Teachers say they are favourable since Mr. Welply left.

- (11). Roll No. 7446.

Teacher appointed assistant in a school near his present one, in July, 1890; and principal in above Roll No. in January, 1904. During his assistant years, he got favourable records, and principal got promotion to First of First Grade for highly efficient service.

Reports 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905 and 1906 "Good" from inspectors. Mr. Welply, in 1907, lowered mark to "Fair." Promotion to Second Grade then due, but refused in consequence of Mr. Welply's "Fair." Mr. Lehoue kept mark at "Fair" in 1908. For years 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912 and 1913 all "Good." Teacher appealed against the reduction of mark to "Fair" in 1907. The result—Dr. Starks replied: "You will have Mr. Lehoue next year, and I hope he will give you "Good." Teacher no promotion until 1911.

- (12). Roll No. 9208.

On 16/9/1908, inspector wrote in Observation Book:—"It would be better to have one teacher in charge of desk lessons exclusively, and one of floor lessons." Teacher obeyed.

On 13/12/1910, Senior wrote in Observation Book:—"Change organisation in accordance with my oral suggestions," i.e., change his predecessor's recommendation.

- (13). Roll No. 13942.

Reports for 1900, 1901 and 1902 "Very Satisfactory," "Good" and "Fair," but only barely so—this last from Mr. Welply. Reports for 1903, 1904 and 1905 "Very Good," "Good" and "Fair." Reports for 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909, 1910, 1911, and 1912 "Good," "Good," "Good," "Fair," "Good," "Good" and "Good," respectively. Manager applied for teachers' promotion in 1908. Mr. Daly then sent on, and mark reduced to "Fair." Teacher says:—"Report reduced to 'Fair' on three occasions when movement should be due."

- (14). Roll No. 12410.

Teacher promoted to Second Grade from 1st July, 1903. Reports for years 1904 and 1905 "Good" from Senior Inspector. In 1906—increment year—report reduced to "Fair," and increment stopped by District Inspector.

APPENDIX LX.

Obtained on by Miss C. E. Nelson, President, L.S.P.S. Notes furnished by Mr. George Bennett, O.M.D. L.S.P.S., (continued).

Typical examples of Teachers suffering seriously from the system of "Short History." When the Teachers' Movement, or Federation is in the (average) No. 1 position, the "Short History" is frequently kept in and under the way.

Notes	Ref. No.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Remarks
General	1200	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	Presented (Short) for the Council, in 1900. Since then no movement. (Notes) from the Council, No. 1 (1901) — "Short History" was for the "Plan" that made no connection with the system of provision in England and kept on in Canada, as I can see nothing left."
Dr. Smith's, (Notes) Dr. Smith's, (Notes) Dr. Smith's, (Notes)	1201	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	Presented (Short) for the Council, in 1900. Since then no movement. (Notes) from the Council, No. 1 (1901) — "Short History" was for the "Plan" that made no connection with the system of provision in England and kept on in Canada, as I can see nothing left."
General	1202	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	Presented (Short) for the Council, in 1900. Since then no movement. (Notes) from the Council, No. 1 (1901) — "Short History" was for the "Plan" that made no connection with the system of provision in England and kept on in Canada, as I can see nothing left."
General	1203	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	Presented (Short) for the Council, in 1900. Since then no movement. (Notes) from the Council, No. 1 (1901) — "Short History" was for the "Plan" that made no connection with the system of provision in England and kept on in Canada, as I can see nothing left."
General	1204	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	Presented (Short) for the Council, in 1900. Since then no movement. (Notes) from the Council, No. 1 (1901) — "Short History" was for the "Plan" that made no connection with the system of provision in England and kept on in Canada, as I can see nothing left."
General	1205	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	Presented (Short) for the Council, in 1900. Since then no movement. (Notes) from the Council, No. 1 (1901) — "Short History" was for the "Plan" that made no connection with the system of provision in England and kept on in Canada, as I can see nothing left."
General	1206	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	Presented (Short) for the Council, in 1900. Since then no movement. (Notes) from the Council, No. 1 (1901) — "Short History" was for the "Plan" that made no connection with the system of provision in England and kept on in Canada, as I can see nothing left."
General	1207	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	Presented (Short) for the Council, in 1900. Since then no movement. (Notes) from the Council, No. 1 (1901) — "Short History" was for the "Plan" that made no connection with the system of provision in England and kept on in Canada, as I can see nothing left."
General	1208	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	Presented (Short) for the Council, in 1900. Since then no movement. (Notes) from the Council, No. 1 (1901) — "Short History" was for the "Plan" that made no connection with the system of provision in England and kept on in Canada, as I can see nothing left."
General	1209	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	Presented (Short) for the Council, in 1900. Since then no movement. (Notes) from the Council, No. 1 (1901) — "Short History" was for the "Plan" that made no connection with the system of provision in England and kept on in Canada, as I can see nothing left."
General	1210	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	1900 Mr. Smith	Presented (Short) for the Council, in 1900. Since then no movement. (Notes) from the Council, No. 1 (1901) — "Short History" was for the "Plan" that made no connection with the system of provision in England and kept on in Canada, as I can see nothing left."

Lower No. 1	1887	1888	1889	1890	1891	1892	1893	1894	Principal, (Present Term, before the period of retirement and resignation "leave" was got in another office)
Greene	1884	1888 O Mr. Tolson	1888 F Mr. Morgan	1888 —	1888 F Mr. Morgan	1888 F Mr. Morgan	1887 F Mr. Daily	1886 O Mr. Loh	Principal (Present) One week's salary, only not mentioned (1886) for his grandfather's sorrow
Hayden	1884	1887 O Mr. Daily	1886 O Mr. Chandler	1886 O Mr. Marshall	1886 F Mr. Marshall	1886 O Mr. Chandler	1886 O Mr. Chandler	1885 O Mr. Davis	Principal (Present) One week's salary, only not mentioned (1886) for his grandfather's sorrow
Kearney	1887 1888	1888 O Mr. Chandler	1887 F Mr. Chandler	1887 O Mr. Marshall	1887 —	1887 F Mr. Marshall	1887 O Mr. Chandler	1886 O Mr. Chandler	Principal (Present) One week's salary, only not mentioned (1886) for his grandfather's sorrow
Lynch	1884	1888 O Mr. Chandler	1888 F Mr. Chandler	1888 O Mr. Marshall	1888 F Mr. Marshall	1888 O Mr. Chandler	1888 O Mr. Chandler	1887 O Mr. Chandler	Principal (Present) One week's salary, only not mentioned (1886) for his grandfather's sorrow
McDonald	1888	1888 O Mr. Chandler	1888 F Mr. Chandler	1888 O Mr. Marshall	1888 F Mr. Marshall	1888 O Mr. Chandler	1888 O Mr. Chandler	1887 O Mr. Chandler	Principal (Present) One week's salary, only not mentioned (1886) for his grandfather's sorrow
Pollock	1888	1888 O Mr. Chandler	1888 F Mr. Chandler	1888 O Mr. Marshall	1888 F Mr. Marshall	1888 O Mr. Chandler	1888 O Mr. Chandler	1887 O Mr. Chandler	Principal (Present) One week's salary, only not mentioned (1886) for his grandfather's sorrow
Reynolds	1888	1888 O Mr. Chandler	1888 F Mr. Chandler	1888 O Mr. Marshall	1888 F Mr. Marshall	1888 O Mr. Chandler	1888 O Mr. Chandler	1887 O Mr. Chandler	Principal (Present) One week's salary, only not mentioned (1886) for his grandfather's sorrow
Stoughton	1888	1888 O Mr. Chandler	1888 F Mr. Chandler	1888 O Mr. Marshall	1888 F Mr. Marshall	1888 O Mr. Chandler	1888 O Mr. Chandler	1887 O Mr. Chandler	Principal (Present) One week's salary, only not mentioned (1886) for his grandfather's sorrow

[illegible]

APPENDIX LXI.

(Handled in by Miss C. M. Mahon, President, I.N.T.O. Prepared by J. McGrath, B.A., Kilmorree (I) B.N.S., Ballaghaderreen; District Representative on Central Committee, I.N.T.O. for Counties Sligo, Mayo, and Galway).

Monitor, '86-'91, Tournaghbeack, Ballaghaderreen.

Assistant, '86-'91, Cleonfyon N.S., Charlestown.

Principal, Anghastha B.N.S. Ballaghaderreen, '96-1904.

Principal, Kilmorree (I) B.N.S., Ballaghaderreen, '04-'13.

PART I.

I have worked in rural schools since my first appointment, and I believe that the change of system in 1900 has not been of any appreciable advantage to such schools, nor to the teachers in charge of them. The following are a few facts in connection with my first school, Anghastha. TH 1890 is maintained at an average of 35 to 40. This average was then sufficient to allow the services of the highest classed and best qualified teachers under the National Board. A school-fellow of mine, Mr. Drury, was appointed principal at this school about 1896. He was trained and classed Ist. His first year's emoluments amounted to £38. In 1892, the Education Act was passed, and the teacher, after five or six years' service, obtained P Class. His emoluments for 1893 were £113, and for 1894, £116. The numbers examined for results were, in these years, 44 and 56 respectively. The average was between 35 and 40. He was promoted to a somewhat larger school—average, 65 to 70. Here his Consolidated Salary, in 1900, was fixed at £129, exclusive of Capitation, £15.

I succeeded to this school in 1896, was trained and classed II. I obtained Ist Class in 1898. In 1899, the average fell below 35, and in 1900 the New System was established. Promotion by classification and examination was abolished. I could not, therefore, get into higher class, but I obtained the B.A. degree in the R.U.I. in 1902, which placed me on a par, at least, with the old P Class men. My consolidated salary in 1900 was fixed at £88, £86 of which was personal to myself, and the balance was paid as capitation. I could get no further increase till 1905, when I was promoted to Grade II., with an increase of £7 per annum. I worked, therefore, for eight years with average annual emoluments of something less than £88. In 1904, I was appointed to my present school, average then 36, now 60-65. I got increments in 1906 and 1909; and promotion to Grade Ist from April 1st, 1912, but without any increase of salary. After my new appointment in 1904, my manager applied for a re-consideration of my salary. It was refused on the plea that the present system of increments and promotion would do justice to cases such as mine. With this refusal of re-consideration, I must suffer the grievance of being promoted without the salary of the grade for an indefinite length of time. Even had I got my grade salary, I can never hope, under present average regulations, to reach the salary which my predecessor Mr. Drury, enjoys in a like school and district to my own, but which was reached previous to 1900, even though he also, under the 70 average rule, can never gain admittance to the First Division of First Grade.

To carry the contrast between the New and Old Systems still further, I have been succeeded in Anghastha (now amalgamated) by a pupil of mine, and Mr. Drury, Mr. D. Carol. This teacher has obtained the B.A. Degree, the Higher Diploma in Education, and is a candidate for the M.A. Degree. He commenced in 1904, at £56, obtained special promotion after eight years' service to Grade II. His present emoluments are about £97, but he can never pass Grade II., as the average of the amalgamated school is less than 50. He can, therefore, never attain to the same salary which Mr. Drury had in a small school before 1900, and which was reached after a few years' service. I need not point out the disadvantages to education in rural schools that must result from such a system.

PART II.

(Statement concerning Mayo and Galway).

In 1911, I was elected District Representative of Sligo, Mayo and Galway on our Central Committee. Since then, I have found that complaints were very general as regards the system of inspection, and the fact that increments and promotion depend so much on the merit mark of the school or teacher. These complaints, however, seem to be founded on the grounds that the financial prospects of the teacher and the educational character of himself and his school are so much at the mercy of the personal peculiarities and whims of the inspector and the circumstances of the school district, where the teachers' work happens to be cast. Since the Committee of Inquiry was appointed, numbers of these complaints have come into my hands. I have summarised certain of these from Mayo and Galway.* I was asked to take charge of certain cases affecting bilingual schools, and these also I have summarised and I hand them in. The summaries have been tabulated from signed statements sent me by the teachers concerned, and which I have in my possession.

Teachers in the West complain that local circumstances, the poverty of the people, migratory labour, and the consequent irregular attendance during the summer months, the holding of annual inspections at any and every season of the year, peculiar occupations of people and children such as fishing and turf-cutting in towns, fevers and epidemics, and other causes interfering with the efficiency of the schools were not sufficiently taken into account in awarding the merit mark. Schools and teachers in backward and mountainous districts, as are found in Mayo and Galway, should not be judged by the same standard, or with the same critical eye for perfection as those situated in more favoured localities. In this connection, I beg to draw your attention to the statement sent in by Mrs. Healy of Lettermullen, Connemara; also to those of Miss Garvey, Inishmaestro, Lough Corrib; and Martin Reedy, Castlebar.

Again, the teachers of the West have been, and are faced with the language problem. So long ago as 1890, the teachers of Rossmore, Galway, with their manager memorialised the Board about their position, and the standard of examination adopted is English. Mr. Welch was then their inspector, but the memorialists appealed rather against the system than against the inspector. They pointed out the irregularity of attendance owing to poverty, &c. They also pointed out that as the language of the children was wholly Irish, it was unfair to test their progress by the use of what was to them a foreign language. I have been told, that after investigation by a senior inspector, the result was more in the nature of a reprimand for the teachers than otherwise. Many of the inspectors were not in sympathy with Irish teaching—notably Mr. MacMillan in the West. In 1901, the Board offered to sanction special programmes suited for special circumstances. Miss O'Malley, Shanassaraham N.S., Connemara, whose brother had won a prize for a model bilingual school programme offered by the Archbishop of Dublin, sent such a programme as is now used in bilingual schools. It was sanctioned, but she came into contact with Mr. MacMillan (1903-5), who insisted on examining on English lines wholly. He was unable to examine in Irish, as he knew nothing

* Vide Appendix LXIV.

of it. There was little trouble in proving her inefficient in a purely Irish-speaking locality when efficiency is tested from the English language point of view. Local disputes between her people and the manager were utilised, and this with her inefficiency brought about her dismissal.

Meantime, public opinion, organised by the Gaelic League had been calling for better treatment for Irish, and insisting that it should get its proper place in Irish national schools, and especially in the Irish-speaking districts. The Board has apparently fallen in with public opinion, but we say it does so by placing obligations and penalties on the teachers which cannot be justified. It allows the introduction of the bilingual programme. It insists on its introduction in many districts, but instead of finding proper facilities for the training of teachers in Irish and bilingual teaching, it insists also on the teacher concerned, no matter what his age, training, or length of service under old conditions, preparing himself at his own expense to conduct the bilingual school. Otherwise recognition of the teacher is a "matter for consideration." In this connection, I read in the statements of the teachers of Mullinahone Boys' and Girls' Schools, Dungarvan. I may also mention that a Belmullet teacher, since deceased, was forced to give up a large school and take a smaller one, because he was unable to become a bilingual teacher, at the age of 45, though otherwise more than fully qualified for school work, and recognised by the Board. Many teachers, thus forced, were unable to, at once, make a success of the bilingual programme. Some of the inspectors, even those with Irish sympathies, were, however, inexorable as far as the merit mark was concerned, and the school report went down, with the usual disastrous result to the teacher. Such cases may be pointed out in the summaries handed in.

Many teachers, as in Mayo, besides teaching the language as an extra, placed it on the ordinary Time-table of their schools; that is, to be taught within school hours. The senior inspector in Mayo,

it is alleged by the teachers of that county, whether because he looked askance at Irish, or through and in the efficiency of the school because of an otherwise overloaded programme, used his influence in many cases to have the teaching of Irish as an ordinary subject abolished. At any rate under his term as Senior, the teaching of the subject was not encouraged. The number of schools where it forms part of the programme has gone down about 30 per cent in Mayo. At the same time a large number of teachers were complaining of a general lowering of reports. A few were even threatened with dismissal. The Castlebar teachers, in January, 1912, passed a resolution protesting against this general lowering of reports by Mr. Cusack, especially where Irish is being taught. This resolution appeared in the local Press, and for its publication certain teachers concerned had afterwards to express regret, by the Board's orders. They did so, but they still protest against the lowering of reports in the district, and they yet look for some remedial measures in the future. The cases of some of these men appear in the summary* handed in.

Regarding Galway, the teachers complain that while a certain Senior, now ill, was in charge, too many unjustified reductions in the merit mark took place, and that too many retentions have taken place at the last year for movement or promotion. They also complain of the peculiarities of the gentleman and his methods of examination and inspection being allowed to interfere with the work of the school and the value to be placed on it.

In conclusion, I beg to point out that while the circumstances and conditions that surround Irish school life remain as they are; and while human nature in children, teachers, and inspectors is such as it is, the present system is bound to give cause for general complaint, and no genuine educational work can be done till all causes of friction between the teacher on one side and the inspectorate and administration on the other have been removed.

JOHN McGRATH.

APPENDIX LXII.

(Compiled by Miss C. M. Mahon, President of the Irish National Teachers' Organisation).

IRISH NATIONAL TEACHERS' ORGANISATION

RULE 127(b).

Report of Deputation to the Resident Commissioner.

A deputation, consisting of Mr. John Nealon, F.F.S.R., President; Mr. J. J. Hazlett, M.A., Vice-President; Mr. Philip Ward, Mr. M. O'Doherty, and the Central Secretary, waited on the Resident Commissioner, last Saturday, to protest against the new rule concerning the enrolment of boys under eight years of age, and to advocate the withdrawal of it.

The President opened the proceedings by showing very forcibly the great injury which the rule is calculated to inflict on principal teachers, many of whose schools when these boys are excluded, will fall below an average of 20, thereby reducing their salaries to the minimum of 3rd Grade, and depriving them of all hope of increment or promotion. In the case of assistants, he showed that the operation of the rule would be altogether ruinous, as great numbers of these teachers would inevitably be thrown out of employment.

The Vice-President strongly represented the difficulty of maintaining an average of 35 in many boys' schools at present, and the utter impossibility of doing so when the new rule comes into force. He also pleaded hard for the assistants, who, though absolutely competent, are now threatened with wholesale dismissal.

Mr. Ward showed the great injury to boys' schools which must result from cutting down the staff of teachers employed in them, and gave reasons for expecting that the education of infant boys would not be improved by the proposed change. He further claimed that no teacher should be made to suffer in income or status without any fault of his own.

Mr. O'Doherty pleaded for the assistants whose

interests are so seriously jeopardised, and quoted instances to show the appalling hardship with which they are so unjustly threatened. Many of them have long service, have families depending on them for support, and are now confronted with the terrible prospect of losing their sole means of living.

The Central Secretary quoted the last Report of the Commissioners, from which he had culled by counties the number of boys' schools in which the attendance will fall below 20 when the rule comes into force, and the number of assistants in larger schools from whom salary will be withdrawn. . . . He cited the opinion of Mr. Dale, at whose suggestion the rule is being introduced, and who, in another connection, says:—"The curriculum for younger children cannot dovetail into that for older with such precision as if the school as a whole were under the control of a single mind."

Dr. Stankie does not believe that the rule will have the prejudicial effects which the teachers expect. He is strongly in favour of amalgamation for the promotion of which the rule seems designed. It is almost certain that the Treasury will allow principal teachers who become assistants by the amalgamation of schools to retain their present salaries in their future positions. Schools that have only one assistant are not to lose his services by the operation of the rule—no two-teacher school will be made a one-teacher school. He very emphatically stated that the rule has not been made in the interests of economy or at the instance of the Treasury, and that the amount paid to salaries as a whole will not be diminished.

According to Dr. Stankie, the immediate effect of the rule will be scarcely perceptible. There is to be no transfer of any pupils whose names are at present on the rolls of boys' schools, the rule refers only to future enrolments. It will take four or five years to bring it into full operation, and it is not to be

*Fide Appendix LXIV.

approved at all except where there is a suitable girls' school in the locality. A "suitable" school is defined as one "in which there is adequate accommodation of a satisfactory kind, in which the teaching of infants is efficient, and in which the teaching staff is of the same religious denomination as in the neighbouring boys' school." The rule, he said, has been introduced purely on educational grounds, and it will not be withdrawn or altered. He added, that the teachers may make up their minds to this, and that it is useless for them to dash themselves against a stone wall.

He advised the teachers, in private conversation with managers, to advocate the amalgamation of boys' and girls' schools, both in the interests of efficiency, and in that of the teachers who would by that means retain their salaries undiminished. Down to 1892, he said, schools that fell below 35 average were amalgamated without objection from anyone and no reasonable objection can be urged against it now.

Briefly—the rule is to be enforced, subject to the limitations mentioned above, and all the arguments

advanced by the deputation failed to move Dr. Stokes from the position that the rule shall not be altered. The limitations are, no doubt, of considerable importance, but the principle of the rule is to be upheld. It will be seen from the report of last Saturday's meeting that the C.F.C. have decided to seek an interview with the Chief Secretary in reference to this matter amongst others, and that a resolution protesting against Rule 127(v) is to appear on Congress Programme.

The Central Secretary submitted several cases which were noted for inquiry. He also represented that the rule requiring rolls to be marked before 10.30 will have very injurious effects in country schools, especially where there are orphans, but no hope was given that it would be modified even in such cases.

(Signed on behalf of the Deputation),

T. CLARKE,

C. Sec.

APPENDIX LXIII.

(Forwaded by Mr. E. Mansfield, Secretary, Irish National Teachers' Organisation).

Statement.

Owing to the rather unfavourable conditions under which my evidence was given before your Committee, I avail myself of the opportunity given me to send in a supplementary statement, or rather additional notes on matters on which I was examined. To the Committee, I pointed out that I intended to deal first with my own career as showing the hardships inflicted on an individual teacher; next with the case of Circuit 18 and the events that led to my dismissal, then with the method of procedure adopted in trying my case, and finally with the general grievances of the teachers particularly as they affect the progress of Irish education, with some suggestions for reform.

Training and Qualifications.

After spending five years successfully as monitor, I entered the Board's Training College, at Waterford, where I spent two seasons ('97 to '99), having first place at the examinations held by the Commissioners at the end of the first year, and also at the final examination (July, '99), when, with a big margin to spare, I secured Special Distinction. Besides the usual parchment, I secured from the Science and Art Department First Class Certificates in Agriculture (advanced), Agricultural Chemistry, Mathematics, Physiology, and Zoology. I was also awarded First Class Certificates in Christian Doctrine and Physical Drill. Since I left the training college, I have attended courses in Vocal Music, Experimental Science, and Manual Instruction—where expenses were paid by the Board—and in Irish, Military Drill, Singing, Chemistry, and Rural Economy, at my own expense.

Passing the final examination with "special distinction" entitled me, under the existing rules (Rule 166, 1898 edition), to the first division of Second Class, with a title without examination to Second Division of First after two, and to First Division of First, after seven additional years of highly satisfactory service. Thus, under these rules and in a school of 35 of average attendance, I could have been, without examination, after nine years in the first division of the highest class, and by successfully undergoing an examination, this period could have been shortened to five years. But by the revolutionary rules of 1900, my rights, though I had been trained and had given eight months' recognised service (Rule 166(b), 1898 edition) before April, 1900, my rights (I say) like those of hundreds of transition and undergraded teachers were ignored, and though I got what the Commissioners termed "special consideration," I found myself after nine years of highly satisfactory service principal of a school of 50, but in the very lowest grade as regards salary.

Should I leave the profession, I was bound, under contract, to repay to the State the amount expended on my training, but my classification and salary rights were ruthlessly broken by the Board, on whom it seems no law or contract has any binding force. (See Rule 169 and Form of Contract, 1898 edition). The table appended gives particulars regarding my service, on which I wish to offer the following observations:—

(1) When appointed as Principal of Cullen Boys' School, on 1st January, 1902, I had given upwards of two years' highly satisfactory service, and was entitled to rank as L¹ class teacher. The salary of my predecessor who held L¹ class was, exclusive of capitation, about £112. I was placed on £96.

(2) It took twenty-one months' correspondence to get from the Board partial justice in the form of an increase of £30 per annum from date of appointment as principal. Had I accepted defeat easily, I should never have got even this. The Commissioners, however, in fixing the salary at £76 were, as I shall prove, even on their own admission, guilty of an injustice, but the object is quite plain, for this device kept me, though average and superior were satisfactory, six years and four months in going from a salary of £76 to one of £87. Three years' efficient service was later rewarded by the princely increment of £1 per annum. In a correspondence which took place between the Very Rev. Manager and the Commissioners, the latter state:—

"In reply to your letter of the 16th ultimo relative to the salary payable to Mr. E. Mansfield, Principal Teacher of the above-named (Cullen) School, I am directed to inform you that this teacher, whose first appointment as assistant dates from 30th April, 1890, received on appointment as principal teacher from 1st January, 1902, a special salary of £70 per annum (exclusive of capitation), that being the average earnings of a teacher of his class (L¹) under the Old Rules, in a school of the size of Cullen Boys'. His claim to rank as second division of First Grade teacher after two years' service, could not be conceded, Mr. Mansfield not having given any service as teacher previous to April, 1900."

I have already pointed out that under Rule 166(b) service as substitute was recognised for other purposes, and if admitted for this, I had upwards of two years' service given on 1st January, 1902. But excluding this, I had 29 of the 24 months' service completed, and there was no justification whatever for fixing my salary as if such service were never given, especially as I got no opportunity of completing the four months' service which would have meant a difference of £10 15s. in salary. Putting this harsh treatment for the moment aside, the Commissioners

did not, as they state above, give me "the average earnings of a teacher of his class (First of Second) in a school of the size of Cullen Boys'. These would be exclusive of capitation—(1) The fixed salary of Second Class—£58 15s.; (2) the average results earned in a school of 41 pupils (average attendance then in Cullen Boys'), £25 12s.

[NOTE.—The Results Fees and Customs and Excise Grant in a school of 36 pupils—£21 17s. (Vide Report of Commissioners for 1904, page 17). For a school of 41 pupils, the amount would be $\frac{41}{36}$ of £21 17s.—£26 12s.] Total, £78 8s.

It is clear, then, that if the figures in the tables given in the 1904 Report are accurate, my salary should have been fixed, not at £76, but at £78 from 1st January, 1902. The difference seems small, and yet the "surrender" of this £2 which the Commissioners withheld meant to me, in the 1911 years that followed, a loss of upwards of £81, and the loss would have continued at the rate of £10 or more per annum, till I reached the maximum income. The following table shows the actual salary paid, the salary I calculated according to the Commissioners' own figures, and the loss—

Date.	Actual Salary.	True Salary.	Loss.
From 1-1-'02 to 1-4-'06.	£76 x 3½	£78 x 3½	£ 2 4
From 1-4-'06 to 1-4-'08.	£77 x 3	£81 x 3	30 0 0
From 1-4-'08 to 1-4-'11.	£87 x 3	£97 x 3	30 0 0
From 1-4-'11 to 1-10-'12.	£97 x 1½	£107 x 1½	15 0 0

Aggregate loss—£81 12s. 4d.

All this was pointed out to the Commissioners; the gentleman who fixed my salary admitted that he was in error if the table in the 1904 Report were correct. He advised me to bring the matter again before the Board, as he believed I was wronged. But the Education Office would vouchsafe no explanation, and the whole thing appeared a mystery to me till in August, 1912, Mr. Beaupre Wyse, in the hearing of Mr. Doyle, admitted that the figures in those tables in the blue book presented to Parliament were false. He said that in the calculation infants' schools, where the fees charged were low, were excluded, and that instead of 12s. 6d., the average per head given, it should have been 11s. 4d. per unit in average attendance. But mine is not an infants' school, and here the results would be far more than the 12s. 6d. per head. So that even reckoning on 12s. 6d. only per head, the amount above taken as given in the Commissioners' Report, the salary is under-estimated. But the wrong was to be inflicted, the Board had the power, and unaided add what I honestly earned.

(3) Relying on Rule 100(e), the Commissioners, in 1905, gave me for three years' satisfactory service a partial increment of £1 per annum. This rule runs—

"Teachers must, as a rule, remain three years on the maximum of a grade before becoming eligible for promotion to a higher grade."

This provides for exceptions, and exceptions have been made—I quoted three for the Board, giving the details—in cases of teachers with poorer qualifications, smaller schools, and less efficient service than mine. Increments of £3, £4, and even £5 have first been given and afterwards promotion for the same three years' service. Yet, if ever an exception was to be made, it should be in the case of a teacher treated as I have been. But I was not capable of manipulating the wires by which justice is channelled from Tyrone House. How does this treatment agree with the fine sentiments found in the public utterances of the Resident Commissioner? It is not "the hereditary enemy" this time.

(4) From the date of examination till I received the report, the average delay was seven weeks. On the two occasions (1908 and 1910) when the school mark was reduced, the delay was almost eight weeks. I was not aware in either case what mark was to be

given ("Good" or "Very Good") till I received the report. "The length of time that had elapsed," would then, did I desire a re-examination, have been set up as a barrier to justice. The officials state that the report is sent out in two or three weeks. In 1908, the usual delay has been six to seven weeks; in several cases it has been delayed for months. (For example, in Killybegs Boys' School, eleven months).

(5) In 1908, Mr. McEnery reduced the mark, because the Science Note-books were not regularly written up, and Geography was not up to the usual standard in the senior classes. The practical work in Science had been methodically done by the teacher and pupils, and thus I then regarded as of far more importance than the correct transcription from a blackboard of the teacher's notes which often passes muster for Science "teaching." The response in Geography was not as satisfactory as the teaching merited, but this would be accounted for by the fact that I had just got by post a new map of the British Islands, which was crowded with details. It was not the one I had ordered, but it had to do duty, and the boys being unaccustomed to it answered but faintly. I was not then aware of the importance of "Very Goods" for special promotion. In any case, I should be very slow in appealing against the mark given by Mr. McEnery, whom I regarded as a capable and conscientious inspector, though I thought at the time he had dealt rather severely with me. He has become the taskmaster, among those whom it suits, to regard Mr. Browne and Mr. McEnery as "easy-going." But both were thoroughly competent, honest men, who, when the need arose, could be stiff and searching. Their sympathetic ways did more for education than the pernickish, prying methods of their successors. There is all the difference in the world between those who are anxious to find things right and those who will be disappointed if they do not find them wrong. Between inspectors who wish to find out what has been taught and those who are determined like a surgeon to lay bare the weaknesses, and knife the teacher for what they term his neglect. Unless men in high places are not to be judged by their public utterances, and the circulars issued by the Board to the inspectors are not meant to be obeyed, it is to us absolutely inexplicable how the inspectors who have acted in accordance with the spirit and the letter of the Board's instructions, should be pilloried by a chief inspector and other officials as unreliable, while those who have run counter to everything the Commissioners say they want are pensioned and petted and marked out for promotion. It is peculiar that the very inspectors who on account of their severity are most obnoxious to the teachers are those who are selected to accompany the Resident Commissioner on his motor trips, even into the districts of other inspectors of at least equal standing, educational or otherwise.

(6) I have already explained in a letter published in Appendix IX., Vol. I., the unfair manner in which Mr. Weply examined the senior division in my school. He is good enough to say that: "The condensation of the junior standards alone would prevent his school from getting 'Very Good.'" The statement given below from Miss Cleary shows the way in which the juniors were treated. But the evidence of the two chief inspectors—Messrs. MacNeill and O'Connor—is to the effect that the mark of the school should not have been lowered if the work of an assistant, not to say a J.A.H., were not up to a high standard. Mr. Weply's memory is altogether at fault when he says he informed me that my school was to be marked "Good." When I inquired, he told me that he could not say till he would look up his notes and the written work. From the tests that he gave, and the unfair way in which the pupils were examined, I suspected that he would lower the mark, and I drafted that evening (November 28th, 1909) a statement pointing out (1) the unfavourable conditions under which the school was examined; and (2) the unfair methods adopted by Mr. Weply in his examination. This statement I brought to the Very Rev. Manager next evening, and I pointed out that I wished him to appeal to the Board. He said that this course would probably be unwise, especially as I was not aware of what mark would be given; that the appeal would probably be refused, and would merely increase the inspectors against me, and that

I would not suffer in increment through the reduction, even if it did take place. He advised me, however, as to the interests of the J.A.M., who was likely to be affected injuriously by the report, a side letter to Mr. Welpy, referring not at all to his own action, but to the unfavourable conditions under which the examination was held. I agreed to write as requested, but I mentioned that I should again consider, if the report would be reduced, the advisability of asking him to appeal. Of this letter I have no copy; but the following is in substance the first paragraph:—

"I have never sought for favours from the Education Office or its officials, and I am not going to begin now. But in connection with the inspection there are some circumstances—I do not now refer to your work—which I would ask you to consider if you wish to arrive at a correct estimate of the school. You have the reputation of being just if severe."

Referring to the first underlined sentence, Mr. Welpy says:—

"Does not the underlined portion plainly imply that he had no fault to find with my tests?"

The letter was written at the request of the manager with the object, not of aggravating, but of conciliating him for the sake of one whose position was threatened and the sentence into which he attempts to read a meaning the opposite of what I intended was put in with the object of justifying me later should the mark be reduced in protesting against the tests to which I said I was not then going to refer. I merely wished the matter put aside for the moment, to be raised again should the result call for further action. Regarding the second sentence underlined, he writes (page 211, Appendix, Vol. I.):—

"This teacher says that truth forces him to state that I am not just, that my reputation—that of a hard taskmaster—came here before me. Yet, in his letter of 30/11/14, which is now before me, he writes:—"You have the reputation of being just, if severe."

Now, of his severity I had certainly heard, from teachers in Rossmore Parish, West Galway, who as far back as 1890 sent to the Board a Memorial regarding his severe marking, and get reprimanded for their pains; from the teachers of Kerry, one of whom, Mr. John Cronin of Scartaght, an efficient teacher, was dismissed for threatening to shoot him, Mr. Welpy being, according to one Commissioner, removed from Kerry to Belfast to save his life; from some of the ablest teachers in Belfast who regarded him as harsh and unympathetic. His justice I took for granted till at the winter meeting of the Co. Tipperary Teachers' Association, held a few weeks later, a number of teachers whom I knew to be able, efficient, and hardworking, convinced me that he was not only harsh, but also unfair in dealing with them. My own experience—not conclusive since I had not got the report—pointed in the same direction. And no option was left me as a representative teacher but to endeavour to redress the injustice by exposing it. I wish to draw attention to other mis-statements in these observations of his which were laid before the Board, and which we never saw or got an opportunity of refuting till long after we were condemned on such evidence by the Board; they were published in these volumes of evidence. On page 211, Vol. I., he says:—

(1) "I went into her school (Cullen Girls'), the Junior Assistant Mistress being present also." The principal writes me: "The Junior Assistant Mistress was not in the school (as he alleges) on 28th July, 1910."

(2) "The J.A.M. had refused to attend an Organizer's Class." This is incorrect.

(3) "She has done this since, however." This also is untrue.

(4) "Register not posted up since 30/4/99." The Register is, in the main, an obsolete book, important in the Results' days for recording passes of pupils, &c. It is mostly simply a piece of red-tape, but in the Roll Book and Report Book are recorded the names and ages of pupils' religion;

attendances, classification, averages, &c. The only matters in Register not recorded in the other books were by me written up-to-date, so that the above conveys to the ordinary reader a misleading and false impression. The register was not written up for three years before my appointment, and sensible inspectors were justifiable enough not to bother teachers about this ridiculous old book. But the essential portions of it were posted regularly.

(5) Mr. Welpy wants to put into my mouth the expression that an "examiner who puts questions in a capable style is necessarily an efficient inspector." My conception of such is certainly higher than a mere machine that turns out questions. Such a false notion of the duties of an inspector would certainly account for his failure in Circuit 18. His professionalism certainly had broader views, and a fuller sense of responsibility.

(6) Again, he says:—"On 15th October, 1910, a pupil told me the key of the school was kept in a cottage a few yards off, and he volunteered to get it, which he did. There are the false pretences under which the school was opened. When the teacher arrived, I was busily engaged making my notes, checking averages, &c. The Daily Report Book I found in the spare drawer of the teacher's desk. I did not fish it out of the press. It was the book I saw in the drawer." Here is what the pupil referred to says:—

(Statement of Bryan Mahony, Pupil of Cullen Boys' School, Tipperary).

"One morning, about a year ago, a short time before November, some other boys and I were near the Cullen School gate, about nine o'clock. A man with a bicycle came up and inquired about the teachers. He also inquired as to where the school key was, and we told him it was always left at Mrs. Kiely's, a house near the school. He asked me to get the key, and I got it. Then I opened the school door, as he asked me, and we all went in. The inspector first went to the teacher's desk, and opened it. Next he sat on a chair, and pulled out the drawer of the table, from which he took the books, those he laid on the table, and was looking over them. Mr. Mansfield came in a few minutes after. The inspector remained sitting at the table. The same inspector came a few weeks later before nine o'clock. It was just after the religious exercises. There was a station in the chapel. He examined me that day. I heard he was Mr. Welpy."

(Signed), BRYAN MAHONY.

October 6th, 1911."

(7) I sent to Mr. Welpy notice of closing of school for annual vacation. He denied in a rather insulting fashion that he got the notice. I'll detail the circumstances under which it was sent. He then got me reprimanded by the Board for neglecting to do what I could prove I had done. The following letter bears on this point:—

(Letter from Mr. Diarmuid O'Croisín, Gneeveguilla N.S., Co. Kerry).

Gneeveguilla N.S.,

Rathmore, Co., Kerry,

October 10th, 1911.

A CHAIRMAN—[In reply to your communication, received this morning, I hereby state that I distinctly remember our cycling together to the Limerick Junction, one evening about the middle of July, 1909—just when the summer holidays were beginning.

I saw with you, among other letters, two which were addressed to "D. T. McEnery, Esq., M.A., Inspector of Schools, Clonmel"; and to "Senior Inspector of Schools, Clonmel".

As the latter rather unusual address gave rise to a discussion on the new Senior, who had just come to the Circuit, I could not fail to remember the incident, especially in connection with posting notice of closing to both inspectors, yet remarked that you heard the new man was a stickler for red-tape.—Mine, in mine most,

DIARMUID O'CROISÍN.

Circuit 18.—The Schools and Teachers.

As a member of the Central Executive Committee of the Irish National Teachers' Organisation—for one year as District Representative, for three years as Vice-President, for one year as President, for one as ex-President, and for one as Central Secretary—I have had ample opportunities of meeting Irish National Teachers from every county. I have visited schools—primary, secondary, and technical—in almost every county in Ireland, and also in England and Scotland. I am convinced that the teachers of Circuit 18 are, as a body, at least equal in ability, industry and honesty to those of any other district I know, and that the schools of the Circuit are, considering all the circumstances, as efficient as those in other counties. All the examinations held by independent bodies adopt for all Ireland a uniform standard. The Technical Department, the Intermediate Board, the National University, &c., would go to prove that the standard of education in Tipperary and East Limerick is far above the average. All educationalists know that it is impossible to have a sound system of Technical, Secondary, or Higher education unless the foundations are well laid in the primary school, and it is no less true that successful work in the senior standards of a primary school must be based on effective teaching in the lower standards. A letter has been handed in from the Very Rev. Father Pembroke, President of Rockwell College, one of the most noted, if not the most noted, of Irish secondary schools. He speaks of his wide experience in examining year after year for scholarships, boys from schools in every county in Ireland, and students who come from abroad. He states that he found the boys from the schools of Circuit 18 at least equal to those of any other district in Ireland, and it is a remarkable fact that some of their most brilliant students—including a youthful scientist of European reputation—have come from the schools most harshly dealt with by Mr. Welby. It is a remarkable fact, too, that in the Vere Foster Competitions in writing, which are open to all schools in the British Empire, the most coveted prizes in this subject which Mr. Welby, in his report for 1910-11, implies we leave "to Nature," have come year after year to the condemned schools of Circuit 18. Again, at the largest of the *feiseanna* held in Munster, that of Limerick, where schools from Limerick and all the neighbouring counties compete in History, Music, and Irish, the shield given to the most successful school whose average is under 60, has come, except on one occasion, to the condemned schools of the non-Irish speaking circuit. It is remarkable, too, that the most noted teachers within the circuit, whether from the point of view of high qualifications, or of successful careers as teachers either signed or were vitally concerned in the memorial against Mr. Welby.

A gentleman of the wide experience of Mr. R. Downing, late Chief of Inspection, is feared to state in the memorandum sent in to the Committee—

"I affirm advisedly that no inspector can give a reliable judgment on the character of a school on his first inspection of it, even with a careful examination. An inspector must be in sole charge of a district for at least two years before he has anything like a reliable knowledge of the character of the several schools. After three years he should have a very complete knowledge, and then he will readily detect retrogression or progress where it has occurred.

And this opinion is confirmed by another Chief Inspector, Mr. J. J. Hynds, who, strange to say, was afterwards, so the result of a harmonious visit to the circuit, so ready to support the opinions of inspectors who had been but a short time in the circuit as against the formed opinions of efficient gentlemen who knew from long experience the merits of the schools. (Question 6372, Minutes of Evidence.)—

"Mr. Coffey.—Now, Mr. Downing has told us that he considered that it would require two years for an inspector to become thoroughly acquainted with his district, so that his opinion with regard to the schools would be of any real value?"

Mr. Hynds replies:—"I agree with that."

Yet the unfair marking of which we complained, and the wholesale lowering of reports were all done by Mr. Welby within two years of his appointment here. In fact, before eight months had elapsed, a resolution calling for an inquiry into the conduct of Mr. Cole—one of Mr. Welby's favourite henchmen, and who had little experience of inspection work—was passed by the Tipperary Teachers' Association, on February 26th, 1910, just seven months after Mr. Welby's appointment to Circuit 18. We now know that, at the instance of Mr. Welby, or at least with his approval (see Statements in Appendix IX., Vol. I.) this inexperienced junior inspector who spent only three months in the circuit, and saw merely a few of the schools more than once, lowered the reports in 78 per cent. of the schools he examined. Regarding this contention we had numerous complaints, and they did not cease when he went to Co. Clare, where according to Dr. Sturkie, the schools are good. From statements sent in by teachers, I call the following:—

Roll No. 15240 writes:—

(1) "I sent notice to Senior on previous Saturday of the holding of the religious examinations by the Diocesan Inspector. Mr. Cole was on detached inspector and, of course, did not get notice. He came and insisted on holding annual examination through school was for the day 'closed' for secular instruction. Pupils had no books with them, and were weary after the other examination. Expecting a holiday after religious examination, children were naturally disappointed and restless, and it was most unfair to insist on keeping them. The mark was lowered by Mr. Cole."

(2) The teacher of — school, Roll No. 15970, writes:—

"Report lowered from 'Good' (with a promise of 'Very Good') to 'Fair' by Mr. Cole. No opportunity for appeal given. *My report was not sent from Office for five months after inspection.* Examination too difficult, inspector's manner cold and unsympathetic. Inspector refused to listen to teacher's explanation of causes militating against his work. He gave no hints as to how work ought to be done. Nothing but fault-finding."

(3) The teacher of — School, Roll No. 15970, writes:—

"Mr. Cole examined in November, 1909, and lowered report to 'Fair.' The minute was delayed for five months. Too late to appeal when report was received. . . . I was an idler, according to Mr. Cole, a sort of languid, lazy fool according to Mr. Fitzpatrick, who condemned strongly Mr. Cole's methods, but the methods for teaching Grammar suggested by Mr. Fitzpatrick were in turn denounced by Mr. Welby, and yet Mr. Fitzpatrick, who followed all three, writes:—'The principal is a hardworking, painstaking, and skilful teacher. He makes careful preparations in all subjects, has inspired the pupils with a spirit of earnestness, teaches Arithmetic intelligently, and Geography and History on sight lines. Written work of pupils very carefully done.' Since receiving the above report, I have been rewarded my first increment in Second Grade."

(4) "Inspection held by Mr. Cole on day after re-opening school (Roll No. 14005), and mark reduced."

(5) The principal of — School (Roll No. 1285), writes:—

(a) "Mr. Cole filled pages of Observation Book with damaging and discouraging notes.

(b) "Mr. Cole, in going from girls' school to boys' school, bent down in passing window, with hat off so as not to be seen."

Dosses of complaints of this nature lie before me. The resolution of the Tipperary Teachers was forwarded to the Education Office, and acknowledged by Mr. Dilworth, but no action was taken by the Board. Mr. Dilworth, however, in his evidence before the Committee, denies that any attention was

called to this matter. Question No. 942, Mr. Coffey—"Would the Office not take any notice of the exceptional action of the Inspector (Mr. Cole), or question his reduction of the mark to 75 per cent. of the schools he inspected?"

Mr. Dilworth replies:—"Well, it is one of those things that attention was not called to. I was aware that Mr. Cole was a little more severe possibly than other inspectors, but I would not know that that was being done in such a large number of cases." But why was no action taken on the appeal by the Tipperary teachers sent up in the Spring of 1910, asking for an investigation into this question of wholesale lowering? The Education Office cannot plead ignorance of the state of affairs in Circuit 18. They knew how matters were long before our memorial went up to the Board in June, 1911. We are fully aware, on the authority of Dr. Starke and others, that at each meeting of the Board all answers to Parliamentary questions, as well as all resolutions from Managers and Teachers' Associations are submitted in print. This being the case, it was altogether impossible that the above resolution could have escaped the Resident Commissioner. Neither could the following question and the answer for which he is responsible as head of the administration.

From Hansard, 22nd April, 1910, I take the following:—

"Mr. Callinan asked the Chief Secretary if he will state how many schools in Circuit 18; did the Office of National Education receive annual inspection returns since July, 1909; the number of schools in which the mark of general proficiency was reduced by one step, and by two steps, and the numbers in which the marks were raised?"

Mr. Birrell:—"The Commissioners of National Education consider that it would not be in the public interest to furnish the information asked for in the question."

It is ridiculous, in view of these incidents, for the Education Office people to assume ignorance of a state of affairs of which I have shown they were fully aware before Mr. Weply had been a year in charge of Circuit 18.

Mr. Fitzgerald's lengthy memorandum, in which he polishes off the circuit to Mr. Weply's satisfaction and apparently at his suggestion, was written before he had spent three months in the circuit. Yet two experienced chiefs state it would take two years' experience before an inspector could give an opinion of any real value. And a number of smaller inspectors, who were on hurried passages through the circuit, under the guidance of their senior, or the then potential chief inspector and travelling companion of Dr. Starke, all wise in their generation, agree with Mr. Weply. Mr. Dilworth was asked Question 624, by Mr. Healy:—"Supposing a senior inspector is stricter than the average of senior inspectors, does he influence the junior inspectors under him?"

Mr. Dilworth replies:—"I should say most undoubtedly."

Question 625:—"We have got Mr. Yates's marks, and when Mr. Brown was there he gave 143 schools above 'Fair,' and when Mr. Weply came soon after that not more than half were given as 'Good' or higher. Now, the half of his schools would be 98, so that 143 fell to, say, 100. So we have the junior inspector dealing with the same schools, but under a different senior, reducing the marks above 'Fair' from 143 to, say, 100?"

Mr. Dilworth replies:—"Of course, that is what I stated. I said that a senior inspector's standard affected the standard of his colleagues."

In the case of Timpone's Boy's School, Mr. Weply reduced the mark "Very Good" given by Mr. Yates, to "Fair." Mr. Weply states that Mr. Yates then "admitted to me that his former judgment of the school was entirely wrong (Appendix IX., Vol. I.)." And Mr. Downing proves in his evidence that even a chief inspector had to write his reports to order, and that he should "avoid expressing any opinions adverse to the educational policy of the Board."

Much weight, therefore, cannot be attached to the hastily formed opinions of fledgling inspectors expressed under such circumstances to one who was well known to be a friend and favourite of the Resident Commissioner.

What of the schools examined during his first year here by Mr. Weply himself, when according to Mr. Hynds, he had not spent sufficient time to be capable of forming an opinion of any "real value?" He examined 83 schools. He reduced the merit mark in 45 cases, that is 58 per cent. of all. In 8 schools he reduced the merit two steps.

Let us see what the predecessors of Mr. Weply—all highly efficient, experienced gentlemen—had to say regarding the teachers and schools of Circuit 18.

In Appendix to Commissioners' Report for 1902, Mr. W. A. Browne, Senior Inspector, says:—

- (1) "On the whole, the teachers have acted with good sense (regarding school organisation)."
- (2) "The teachers always welcome suggestions as they knew the difficulty of good arrangements."
- (3) "But few cases of neglect to keep the records clean have been met with."

(4) "The proportion of schools in which the progress made during the year has been described as 'Good' is large. The cases of 'No Progress' or retrogression are very few, so that the instruction of the school-going children of the circuit is to be considered satisfactory."

(5) "Most of the teachers are working with more system and preparation than in the past. Many of them are zealous, and do much more than good service. . . . It is to be regretted that the supplying of maps, blackboards, &c., still falls in many cases on the teachers. The children help a little as do the managers, but the time has not yet come when the teacher can be considered as having an income untaxed by the conditions of his office."

From Appendix to Commissioners' Report for 1903, on page 132, Mr. Browne says:—

"It has been the aim of the inspectors of the circuit to encourage instruction on rational lines, so that the people may not only have a knowledge of the fact, but the reason of the thing, and our experience is that there is progress. . . . It is easy to be critical, and it is a duty to be so, but it is equally an obligation to consider the hindrances to a teacher's work. These are in many cases great, and when successfully overcome, as we so often find, these whose business it is to pass judgment think it a pleasure to praise."

(His successor never seemed to consider this aspect). Again he says—and this is important in view of the implied attack regarding managers, people, and teachers by Messrs. Weply, Little, &c.:—

"The building of new houses has been temporarily checked here as elsewhere by the delay in the sanctioning of the new plans, but a large number of the worst buildings in the circuit are to disappear as soon as the managers have permission to build."

(For six years the game of sending the plans from the Commissioners to the Treasury, and from the Treasury back to the Board continued. Grants were saved, buildings toppled or become dilapidated and unsightly, the health of the teachers and of the children suffered, promotion was stopped owing to defects—the teacher (the victim) being punished and the Culprit Treasury (the victor) being punished and the Culprit Treasury doubly rewarded first by the withheld grants, and then by the unjustly retained increments; and now the people of Tipperary and Limerick are insulted by narrow-minded officials of the Board such as Messrs. Weply and Little for neglecting to do the things for which they were refused the permission of the Board, or the requisite funds from the Treasury. At the very time that it was not possible to get either the plans or the funds from the Board, they threatened the withdrawal of the salaries of the teachers in the Oola, Co. Limerick, schools, because of a bad building which they would not help the manager to replace. From the teachers in Enniscorthy, Queen's Co., and from those of Newtown N.S., Tipperary, they actually withheld the salaries, because of the absence of out-offices in the schools, because of a classroom in the former). Yet later on, and of a classroom in the former). Yet these were the condemned buildings on which the managers and teachers were forced to waste time and money—patching, painting, and decorating with shreds and shivers—to gratify the whims of the Resident Commissioner, who was far more responsible for the neglect than either).

In the same report, page 153, regarding the teachers, Mr. Browne says:—

"A very large proportion of the teachers are well suited to their work, and are highly respected."

And Mr. McEnery, M.A., says:—

"With very few exceptions, the teachers aim at doing real good, and their work is marked by steady enthusiasm, as well as by ability, vigour, and industriousness."

Again, Mr. McEnery says:—

"The teachers, as a body, have evinced a most perseveringly desire to adapt themselves to the conditions of the revised programme. At no inconsiderable inconvenience to themselves they have attended such courses in the new branches as have been held by the sub-organisers in their respective districts, and have incurred no little expense in equipment in their anxiety to take up some of these new subjects in their schools."

And Mr. Browne adds:—

"I have found similar activity in my own section."

Regarding their efforts to ensure good attendance, Mr. Browne refers to "the zeal of managers and teachers." He also says:—

"There is no apparent slackening in the teachers' efforts."

Throughout the reports, reference is made to improvements in Reading, Arithmetic, and Composition.

Regarding Reading, the Senior says:—

"Almost everywhere there is an attempt to make Reading pleasing to the hearer, and in general the result is good."

All point to the fact that owing to the pressure of new subjects, less time can be afforded than under the old system, to such important subjects as Arithmetic. Regarding the extreme difficulty of keeping up a high standard in one teacher schools, then the great majority, Mr. McEnery says: "In very many schools, one competent teacher has to educate single-handed as many as 40 pupils of all ages from three to fourteen, in one room," an opinion echoed by the Commissioners themselves in one of their later reports, when they say that, owing to the number of classes and subjects, it requires a teacher of exceptional industry and skill to maintain in a small school a high standard of efficiency. (Yet, such are the teachers who are deprived owing to averages, &c., of increments and promotions, and against whom most of the penal regulations of the Commissioners are aimed. They profess to foster a desire to keep the people on the land, and to encourage a taste for agriculture, yet their rules tend to drive the best teachers from the agricultural districts to the city slums. "Back to the land" is their cry. "Away to the slum" is their policy).

Extracts from Appendix to Commissioners' Report 1905-6 (Gloucester Circuit).

(1) "The creamery industry is responsible for a considerable injury to the senior standards."

(2) "A reasonable programme is being successfully carried out. (Mr. Browne).

(3) "Of really bad schools there is not one out of a total of 362. (Mr. Browne).

(4) "A sense of duty (among the teachers), the incentive to reward, and the check of inspection, co-operate to produce a result that must be described as favourable. (Mr. Browne).

(5) "Much care and attention are now being given by the teachers to the various branches of school work, and as a body they are making earnest efforts to promote the efficiency of their schools. The work of the vast majority of the teachers is of a high order of merit, producing thorough and intelligent results and is usually arranged in well-planned schemes. (Mr. McEnery).

(6) "The great majority of them (the teachers) display commendable zeal and devotion. (Mr. Bannan).

(7) "On the whole, the work done in our schools is, I believe, steadily improving in quality; more intelligent methods of instruction are employed, and active teaching is replacing mere examining. (Mr. Bannan).

(The "mere examining" would have suited best for Mr. Welply's tests).

(8) "Mr. Brown again lays his finger on those responsible for the neglected and dilapidated state of many buildings in the following passage:—

"In the year 1905, only one new schoolhouse was completed, not because managers were unwilling to build, but because grants based on the new plans were not available."

(9) "Speaking generally, we find the grasping of standards earned out sufficiently." (Messrs. Welply and Fitzgerald say the reverse).

(10) "The teachers of the schools which have been exclusively in my own charge have supported me without exception in an effort to establish a really good standard in this subject (Reading). (Mr. Brown).

(11) "The increased attention given to oral composition is having its effects on the Reading."

(12) "The improvement in composition is gradually removing the reproach that there was little understanding of what was read. The shrewd but more intellectual methods of teaching now generally adopted have also done a good deal to improve the explanation of the Reading Lessons." (Mr. Brown).

(13) "Reading, on the whole, is up to a good standard. . . . Pleasant, distinct, and intelligent teaching is found in a very large proportion of the schools." (Mr. MacEnery).

(14) "In the teaching of English, there is distinct evidence of progress." (Mr. Bannan).

(15) "All the inspectors of the circuit are agreed that there is progress in Composition. . . . Where the result is reported as 'Good' there has been hard work and system." (Mr. Brown).

(16) "In the junior standards the progress has been marked, and one is surprised to find occasionally at what an early stage continuous written Composition can be successfully introduced." (Mr. Bannan).

(17) "Of Writing and Spelling there is little to be said. The former gets more of the teacher's attention, and the latter rather less of the pupils, than under the older system of teaching and inspection." (Mr. Brown).

(18) "The teaching of Arithmetic has improved, if not in accuracy, at least in methods and intelligence in most schools. . . . Questions in Mental Arithmetic are in most schools solved by ready methods, and with a reasonable amount of speed and accuracy. (Mr. MacEnery).

Mr. Brown adds:—"My experience is similar," and Mr. Bannan also finds improvement in this branch.

(19) "There is much more attention given to correct speech and writing." (Mr. Brown).

I have quoted these extracts at length in justice to the teachers of Circuit 18. They show what men of distinction, of wide experience and unblemished honour thought of these important subjects, on which Mr. Welply—whose opinion could, according to Mr. Hynes, be of no "real value," owing to his brief experience—and a flock of insipid dodging birds of passage were pleased to pass such sweeping strictures.

OBSERVATIONS IN REPORTS OF MESSRS. WELPLY AND BROWN CONTRASTED.

Mr. Welply says:—

"The teachers sometimes demur to the expense they say such efforts to keep the school clean and pleasing to the eye would entail upon them."

I have shown that his predecessors held the opposite view. But as Mr. Welply aware of the Board's Rules insisting that none of the teacher's income should be spent on a building which does not belong to him? How much of his own salary is spent on the Clonmel Model School of which he happens to be manager? How much of the £1,500 per annum given to the Resident Commissioner is spent in

decorating Tyrone House, or in sweeping the Central Model Schools in Marlboro' Street? Is there any other public building in Ireland, or out of it, on which the employees must spend a portion of their slender incomes in order to retain their positions, and succeed in their work? A teacher does not need to have set before him in the Observation Book a thousand things which he would have no hesitation in doing if they did not mean the expenditure of some of a hardly-won salary needed by his family.

Mr. Welfly says, in 1910-11:—

"In many of the schools, I do not find adequate attention given to sweeping and dusting."

Mr. Brown says:—

"But few cases of neglect to keep the rooms clean have been met with."

Again, Mr. Welfly writes:—

"I do not find as great an interest in primary education here as in Co. Kerry and Belfast."

Yet, Mr. P. J. Kelly (Senior Inspector) points out in his general reports that several of the Belfast schools would, as regards accommodation, sanitation, and ventilation, compare unfavourably with the Black Hole of Calcutta. And the inspectors (including Mr. Welfly) condemn the Belfast teachers in dramatic fashion (See Vol. I, Murmurs of Evidence, Appendix VIII.). Mr. Welfly himself speaks of Belfast teachers taking up subjects for mere show, and he refers to one of the ablest and most respected teachers in Ireland thus:—

"The more I saw of Mr. Laumont, the more thoroughly the conviction gained upon me that he is one of the Belfast teachers who would fain throw all his own work on the shoulders of his assistants."

The Chiefs refer to the excessive leniency of some Belfast inspectors. A junior inspector insults all his predecessors by writing of the Belfast schools:—

"When I took charge, these schools (in Belfast) were in a more backward condition as regards organisation than the schools in South Galway Section were in 1905. In fact, no attempt had been made to organise them on the lines recommended in the Board's programme."

And Mr. MacMillan, another of the seven inspectors whom Dr. Sturges believes to have "the reputation of being a very efficient inspector," says:—

"Taking my district (portion of Belfast Circuit) generally, however, I do not consider the proficiency is quite as high as I found it in Mayo."

And yet the Mayo schools, judging by the marks given by the inspectors, including Mr. MacMillan—personally I do not believe in anything I have quoted from them—are about the worst in Ireland. So much for Belfast. In Kerry, too, the dismissals for inefficiency have been far more numerous than in Circuit 18, simply because in the years following the introduction of the new system, Kerry suffered from an epidemic of the friends and travelling companions of the Resident Commissioner—Messrs. Rynoe, Cusack, Welfly, &c.

I refer to these matters just to show what a mess they make of facts when they face them.

Extracts from Mr. Browne's Report, 1907-8.

(1) "A number of the teachers have zealously carried out suggestions for the improvement of the school premises, and I have often regretted that there was not more time to help those who showed so much good will. (Mr. Browne.)"

(2) "Both my colleagues speak favourably of the teachers as a body. The great majority they consider work regularly and diligently. (Mr. Browne.)"

(3) "The reports for the last two years indicate a favourable general result, and the inspectors have been often struck with the zeal and earnestness of teachers of remote schools with little in their surroundings to stimulate. A sense of duty and the satisfaction of successful effort keep them cheerful, and help them to keep in their scholastic the even tone of their way. (Mr. Browne.)"

(4) "The training of infants has improved greatly in recent years. (Mr. Yates.)"

(5) "I find that reading from the blackboard (for infants) has proved most successful in almost all cases. (Mr. Browne.)"

(6) "Reading, Arithmetic, and Composition have greatly benefited by the improved methods recommended in the 'Notes for Teachers.' The 'Notes for Teachers,' which suggest sounder methods of instruction, have been studied by the teachers, and we find good results on the whole. (Mr. Browne.)"

Yet Mr. Welfly writes three years later:—"I find cases in which that excellent work 'Notes for Teachers' looks as fresh and unutilised as when it left the printer, and when I came here I found instances in which the Board's Programme can scarcely have been read at all." (Mr. Welfly forgets to add that their freshness could be accounted for by the fact that new copies supplied to the schools are practically the same as those of previous years, and there was no need to have the 'Notes' otherwise than unutilised.)

(7) Mr. Browne says:—"Promotion, Mr. Yates considers, is made, except in a few schools is soon as is desirable." Mr. Little, three years later writes to convey the opposite, when he refers to a tendency to delay promotions unduly."

(8) "The inspectors of this circuit (Mr. Yates was one of them) are agreed that there is continued improvement in Reading and Composition." Mr. (Mr. Browne.)

But three years later, Mr. Yates writes:—

"Reading is often indistinct, and in some cases an artificial intonation is adopted to which occasionally accuracy is sacrificed."

(9) "The exceptionally important position assigned to Composition in the school programme has led to great improvement in oral and written expression. The difficulty of this subject in the elementary school is, of course, the fact that pupils have so much to unlearn." (Mr. Browne.)

Yet Mr. Welfly says:—

"It is not surprising that oral composition is weak and written composition characterised by the higher standards by a paucity of ideas."

Again, Mr. Welfly says:—

"The pupils have not attained much facility in oral composition."

While Mr. Browne and all his colleagues found adequate preparation and "well-planned schemes of work," "grouping efficiently carried out"; the teachers honest, able, and valiant and anxious to improve themselves, and to carry out suggestions.

Mr. Welfly says that:—

"Grouping of standards . . . was unknown in many a school in South Tipperary."

And he also states:—

"The teachers do not as a body show sufficient evidence of study, and of endeavour to improve themselves."

To sum up:—

(1) Mr. Welfly and his colleagues dwell on exceptional failings, and struggle educational progress in red-tape. They search apparently for faults, and as if a case against the teachers of Circuit 18 had to make someone.

(2) Mr. Welfly dealt unfairly with the schools by adhering to a style which his predecessors at the bidding of the Office had discarded for a decade. No notice of a change was given, and the pupils prepared according to the spirit of the new system were tested on methods long discarded. More than a year's work was often examined on before half the school year had passed, and examinations were usual within the first three months, and on days of opening after vacation. I wonder what would be the fate of Intermediate Schools or even University Classes if subjected to such a test. No allowance seems to have been made for adverse circumstances, and schools were often tested under conditions that were not normal.

(3) Mr. Browne and his colleagues dwell in their reports on (a) anxiety of the teachers to improve; (b) their interest in the pupils; (c) the readiness of the teachers to undergo expense and hard work to improve the education given in their schools; (d) the

improvements in the principal school subjects, in intelligent methods of teaching, and the efforts made by the teachers to give a tasteful appearance to the schools. They place responsibility for defective buildings on proper shoulders, while the others imply gross neglect on the part of managers and teachers.

(4) Mr. Browne and his colleagues gave substantial help; they discussed matters with teachers, and showed or suggested how defects were to be remedied. They trusted and respected the worker.

(5) Mr. Welby never discussed methods with teachers, or taught in the schools, or showed those whose methods he so liberally condemned how defects were to be removed. He was a mere examiner who put questions, and wrote opinions in the Observation Book regarding alleged defects. He treated the teachers with suspicion and distrust.

(6) The following passage reflects the sympathetic spirit in which Mr. Browne approaches his work:—
"Criticism that is intended to help, not to annoy is never harsh, and experience shows that the spoken word of advice accompanied if necessary by actual doing of what is aimed at produces a greater and more lasting effect than elaborate writings in the Observation Book. The note of sympathy may fairly be demanded by honest workers on whom judgment is being passed." (Mr. Browne's Report for 1907-8).

Mr. Welby says sneeringly in his report for 1910-11:—

"What my colleagues and I are concerned with, however, is that the teachers of this circuit should not fall under the spell of Dogberry who tells us that to write and read comes by Nature."

I have given ample proof that the facts do not justify that malicious sneer at the expense of the teachers of Tipperary, who in their turn are determined that neither he nor any of his colleagues will at their expense fall under the spell of any of those characters whom Harriet Beecher Stowe has painted in such lurid lights.

The efforts of the Teachers of Circuit 18 to obtain redress.

As the attempts of the teachers of Circuit 18 to obtain redress have been already detailed in the first volume of evidence, I shall not attempt to cover the whole ground, but to correct some false impressions that have been made by statements published by the Education Office and its officials, and to piece together some essential facts that at present seem disconnected.

(1) The teachers of Circuit 18 did not complain openly of Mr. Welby's wholesale reduction of merit marks till they were convinced that no justice was to be expected from the Board, and that Dr. Starkie was behind him in his action. That Dr. Starkie, despite his appeal to his public utterances, influenced on various occasions the marking of the inspectors and that as a rule he encouraged the lowering of the mark rather than the raising, the evidence given before your Committee would go to prove. In his 1905 address, at Belfast, he dwelt on the fact that there would be no room for what he termed "lazy and inefficient teachers, if the inspectors do their duty." Dismissals then increased 200 per cent. till, as I pointed out in my evidence, one teacher in every seven ran the risk of dismissal. Those inspectors who were regarded by the teachers as the most severe taskmasters, were the men taken even into circuits not their own by the Resident Commissioner when on his motor trips. He had ample means of influencing the inspectors without giving written authority for "positive instructions are seldom given in such cases."

If any doubt still lingers that I was justified in charging Dr. Starkie with stopping justice from the teacher and encouraging severity, the following letter from Dr. Starkie, to an inspector, should remove it:—

"The case you did write about did come before me some months ago. The manager appealed against your examination, and called at the Office, but did not see me. On looking over the papers, I found that three years ago there was a similar

appeal which was referred to Mr. Purser. He disdained from you in his judgment, and in the following year another inspector also took a higher view of the prociency than you did. I may say that for some time past, I have set my face against re-inspections of schools, which I consider, are unfair to the first inspectors and likely to lead to friction between the members of the staff. Consequently, I refused to allow your results to be checked by Mr. Purser. On the other hand, as your report of three years ago had been referred to Mr. Purser with the result I mentioned, I was compelled to take some action. I directed Mr. Purser to visit the school and to examine it independently, but not to criticise the reliability of your examination. On the receipt of his report, I directed that the manager should be informed that no action would be taken until after the next annual visit, which should take the form of a full examination of the school. As I view the matter, there is no reflection on your efficiency as an inspector. I carefully omitted all possibility of this by ordering an independent inspection, without reference to your report, and I have refused to withdraw your 'mark' at this school although Mr. Purser's is higher than it. P.S.—I have seen your official report since writing the above, and I regret that you should think the action of the Commissioners reflects on your work; nothing was further from our intention. We directed you to hold the examination next year individually in order to bring home to the manager in a way that cannot be questioned, the shortcomings of the school. This is the object of the individual examination."

It is notorious, too, that Mr. Welby was by Dr. Starkie intended for the Chief Inspectorship, and the evidence given by officials before your Committee confirm the impression made on the teachers of Circuit 18, and expressed in my letter of October 14th, 1911, that "he was qualifying for the Chief Inspectorship by the severity which placed him in the leadership." Here we have the autocratic head of a department making speeches and sending out circulars whose sentiments are admirable. His favourite among the inspectors acts in a manner diametrically opposite to the spirit of these public utterances, and he not merely remains a favourite, but he is destined for promotion over the heads of more experienced men. The chief inspectors and others receive hints from their Chief that the schools here, there, and everywhere are *overmarked* (seldom undermarked). The inspectors find that it is the practice of the Resident Commissioner to support them in their severity to refuse appeals, and to keep them on the move if they are lenient. And yet, we are asked to judge this gentleman, not on his acts, but on his utterances.

In two cases in Circuit 18, appeals for re-inspection were made where the mark had been reduced at one stroke two steps. Re-inspection was refused in both cases. This lesson was not lost on other teachers, who, though greatly aggrieved, felt that an appeal would simply make matters worse. The state of affairs, however, became intolerable, and a memorial was prepared and sent to the Board by the Committee of the Co. Tipperary Teachers' Association. Mr. Welby complains that he never saw some of those who signed the memorial against him. But it is distinctly stated that it was signed, on behalf of the aggrieved, not by the aggrieved but by a representative Committee that had fully investigated the case and were convinced that he was acting unfairly. This memorial was sent to the Board, in June, and dealt briefly with general complaints, giving specific instances, and asking the Board to receive a deputation who were prepared to lay before the Commissioners the cases in detail. In the ten cases sent up the average age of the grievance outlined was less than seven months; and, if the delay made by the Office in sending out the reports be deducted, it would be just five months. It takes a considerable time to get isolated teachers, many of them owed by despatch rule, to come together for such a purpose and to prepare statements. Yet complaint is made by the Education Office, with its ample staff and all the necessary returns at hand, that the teachers allowed such a length of time to elapse, while the Commissioners let almost five months slip

before they sent down the Chief Inspector, and it was just six months before we received the final reply of the Board.

(2) In his statements dated 29th August and 26th October, 1911, commenting on our memorial, Mr. Weply makes numerous misstatements which must have, as they were meant to have, an influence on the judgment of the Board, and these we never got an opportunity of meeting. We were in fact unaware of their existence till we saw them in evidence. These have been dealt with in evidence, but there are one or two so glaring, and some implications so serious, that I am forced to refer to them:—

(a) He says:—

"I know that a deputation from the Tipperary Teachers' Association waited on the whole body at Parish Priests of the Diocese of Cashel, when on retreat, at Thurles, last summer, with the object of inducing them to take part in these charges." This is untrue.

(b) Again, he says:—

"But no manager, so far as I am aware, has made any attempt to join in them."

Now, the managers did join in them to the extent of sending a resolution to the Education Office—this was acknowledged—to the effect that the case ought to be investigated by the Commissioners.

(c) In dealing with some cases of falsification, he puts the matter in such a fashion as to make it appear that the teachers who were concerned in the memorial were those guilty of falsifying their accounts. This impression was conveyed not merely to outsiders, but to the managers and teachers of schools, many of whom made inquiries as to which of us was fined £1, which £2, and so on. Now, I have stated emphatically that no teacher concerned in the memorial to the Commissioners is included in the table he gives, and that of the hundred cases which we received from teachers in this circuit, not one came from any person found guilty of falsification. Further, the ten cases which he deals with, were spread over a number of years, some dealt with matters that occurred before his advent to the circuit, and though nearly all the teachers of Tipperary and Limerick Counties are members of our Organisation, six of the ten teachers concerned are non-associated. By far the largest fine, one of £33, deals with a case not of falsification, but of error arising from a justifiable misinterpretation of badly-expressed rules of the Board. This I have dealt with at length in my evidence, and if the other cases are trivial in proportion to the amount of the fines inflicted, there must not have been much fraud about these "falsifications." This, too, we never got an opportunity of clearing up before judgment was pronounced.

(3) In October, 1911, Dr. Starke, Mr. Starke, and Mr. Dillworth visited 76 schools in the circuit. None could be called an expert in inspecting or examining schools. Their visits were hurried—22 to 25 minutes on the average—their inspection most superficial, and before they had visited many schools they gave the teachers the impression that they did not wish to hear complaints. In one school a

lady was asked if she had any complaints against Mr. Weply, and on receiving a negative reply, the impartial judge, the Resident Commissioner, remarked "No good, teacher here." A similar incident occurred in another school. And as the result of this whirlwind inspection, he selected, as he says, "the schools which he considered most favourable to the teachers," not the 13 schools of which, at the request of the Board, we sent in detailed statements of complaint, but 13 which included but six of those of whose marking we complained, and seven others with whose marking we were not concerned at all. One of the schools he selected was marked "Excellent," so that there was no chance of our scoring anything on that. It is peculiar, however, that of the six schools on our list of 13, the report was raised in four, and the following year, by the district inspectors, in the remaining two, while in the 7 schools he added, the report was raised by Mr. Hynes in only one, and this was balanced by a reduction in another. This shows the unreliability or the unfairness of Dr. Starke. But, even in those cases where the Chief Inspector thought a higher mark deserved, the teachers were kept in ignorance of the fact, the lower mark of the junior remained, and the teachers got no redress. Mr. Hynes has been good enough to think I did, but he knows only that portion of my case which concerns penalties, and he does not seem to have concerned himself very much about the redress.

(4) In connection with this memorial, Mr. Power, the chief inspector responsible for the schools in the southern half of Ireland, a gentleman whom the teachers regard as reasonable, was altogether ignored; and Mr. Hynes, who had the reputation of being strict and unsympathetic towards the teachers, was selected to re-inspect the schools. Though it would, on his own admission, take two years before one could form an opinion of any "real value" on the schools of a circuit, he arrives rather quickly at the decision that the marks given by the inspector who had least experience here were the correct ones. He is good enough to say that "we were not prepared to give Mr. Weply a fair trial." As if we were responsible through crass stupidity for the wholesale lowering of reports and the sacrifice of our increments and promotion. He also quotes from a private and privileged letter sent by me through Mr. Keegan to the Commissioners at their own request, and he adds:—

"If a public utterance of this kind by a teacher is allowed to go unpunished, the effect on the teaching body will be most injurious."

He then debates to the Board as to the manner in which the teachers of Circuit 18 are to be snubbed, and the way in which the white-washing of Mr. Weply is to be performed.

Injustice long denied is, however, now admitted.

The aggrieved teachers in Circuit 18 should receive redress, and I should receive my reward for convincing the Commissioners of the wrong done, and giving them the opportunity of playing the part of honest men.

DETAILS OF SERVICE

Date.	Capacity.	School.	Salary.
September 11th, 1899, to April 30th, 1900.	Substitute for Principal Teacher.	Ballindaggin, Co. Wexford.	Private agreement with Principal, £50* per annum.
April 30th, 1900, to 1st January, 1902.	Assistant Teacher ..	Oola, Co. Limerick ..	£70† ..
1902	Principal Teacher ..	Cullen Boys' School, Co. Tipperary.	£76 ..
1903	Do.	do.	£76 ..
1904	Do.	do.	£76 ..
1905	Do.	do.	£77 ..
1906	Do.	do.	£77 ..
1907	Do.	do.	£77 ..
17th June, 1906 ..	Do.	do.	£87 (from 1st April).
1909	Principal	Cullen Boys'	£87 ..
March 10th, 1910 ..	Do.	do.	£87 ..
November 23th, 1910 ..	Do.	do.	£87 ..
October 25th, 1911 ..	Do.	do.	£97 ..
November 14th, 1911 ..	Do.	do.	£97 ..
October 9th, 1912 ..	Do.	do.	£97 ..

* For 1 year and 8 months.

† Board at first gave but £56, but 21 months' correspondence raised it to £76, and wrong arrears from there.

GIVEN BY E. MANSFIELD.

Report.	Inspector.	Extracts from Reports, &c.
No specific mark given at head of report in these years.	Mr. Rowan, D.I. ..	"In the absence of the Principal, who is in training, Mr. Mansfield teaches the school with zeal and efficiency.
do.	Mr. Morgan, D.I., and Mr. W. A. Browne, S.I. ..	Praise is given in report to the work of both teachers.
Fair (after 4 months in school).	Mr. Browne, S.I. ..	"The school is still but Fair; but the present teacher (Mr. Mansfield) has done very good work since he came."
Good	Mr. McEnery, D.I. ..	"With the exception of oral English, good progress appears to have been made since last annual inspection."
Good	do.	"The work of this school is faithfully and, on the whole, successfully done, as the answering in the various branches of the Programme shows."
Good	do.	"The results of the year's work are good. . . . The teaching is skilful and effective. . . . The pupils are making creditable progress in their studies."
Very Good	do.	"A very good standard of proficiency has been attained, and the instruction generally is conducted on intelligent lines. Discipline and tone of the school are all that could be desired."
Very Good	do.	"The teaching of the Principal is sound and systematic, and is producing very good educational results. Good work is also being done by the J.A.M. An extensive course of Mathematics has been taught, and there is a high tone of intelligence generally among the pupils."
Good. (Report received August 12th, 1908).	do.	"A good standard of proficiency has been attained in most branches of instruction, and the instruction generally is on intelligent lines. In Observation Book he writes:—"The work of the school goes on systematically and efficiently."
Very Good	Mr. McEnery, M.A., D.I.	"The merit of the inspection is generally satisfactory, and testifies to the skill and success of the instruction, particularly that of the principal teacher. The pupils are making very good progress in their studies, and are in admirable discipline."
Very Good	Mr. Fitzpatrick, D.I. ..	"On the whole, very satisfactory progress is made in this school whether regard be had to oral or written work."
Good. (Report received January 20th, 1911).	Mr. Weply, S.I. ..	"The Principal renders good service on the whole, but he should pay much more attention to the punctual pointing up of his accounts."
Good	Mr. P. J. Fitzgerald, D.I.	"The Principal is highly capable and efficient; the Junior Assistant Mistress only moderately so. The senior groups have been taught intelligently, and are bright and smart."
Very Good	Mr. Hynes, Chief Inspector.	The report of Mr. P. J. Fitzgerald marked "Good" reached me 24th November, 1911, ten days after Mr. Hynes, Chief Inspector, had raised it to "Very Good." The Junior's lower mark stood. The other was never communicated. Pupils did much better with Mr. Fitzgerald.
Very Good	Mr. P. J. Fitzgerald, D.I.	"The school is in a very efficient state. The junior portion of the school has improved under Mrs. Mansfield (appointed 1st April, 1912)."
		Extracts from reports regarding Irish:
		(1) "The classes are making very good progress. The Direct Method is used effectively though not exclusively." (Miss Sullivan, Organizer).
		(2) "Proficiency of classes very satisfactory. All the pupils are taught Irish." (Miss Sullivan, Irish Organizer).
		(3) "Visited and inspected Irish class. The pupils' conversational knowledge of Irish and their ability to read intelligently the lessons of their text-books are both very satisfactory." (Mr. Morgan, Chief Inspector for Irish).
		The Science Organizers mark the proficiency in this subject "Good."
		Mr. McKenna, Organizing Inspector of Drawing, who visited on March 12th, 1912, says:—"Sense of touch is well developed, and many of the drawings executed are very creditable."

(Statement of *(Miss)* Johanna Cleary, Junior Assistant Mistress in Cullen Boys' School from July 1st, 1903, till 31st March, 1912.)

I was appointed Junior Assistant Mistress in Cullen Boys' School, in July, 1906, and till Mr. Welpy came to the circuit my work was always satisfactory. Though the manager (Right Rev. Monsignor O'Neill), the principal, and the parents were all pleased with my services, and though I was doing my duty as well as when my work gave satisfaction to other officials, Mr. Welpy and his successor considered my work unsatisfactory.

I shall give my opinions regarding Mr. Welpy's actions in brief:—

(1) His two visits within five weeks, before nine o'clock, in the depth of winter, and before the time fixed on for opening the school, gave me and others who heard of his action, the idea that he wished to catch Mr. Mansfield in some breach of the rules of the Board.

(2) His manner was severe with the children.

(3) In examining the junior classes, this is what he did:—

Infants.—He pointed to isolated words in their lesson, and included in his examination two infants—Pat Sheehan and John Lillis—who had been put on the roll for the first time that very day. Owing to an epidemic ofumps there were only four others in the infant class. Was his method of testing the pupils sound?

First Standard.—In the First Standard, out of seven on roll, six were present. Five of them were intelligent boys. All were regular attenders. On the average each attended during 1910 about 168 days. Mr. Welpy did not examine these boys in any subject. Except the Drawing Exercises, he did not even glance at their written work.

Second Standard.—On the rolls of the Second Standard, there were eight pupils. Of these, five were absent (all with mumps) and three present (one of whom had that day returned to school after a long absence). All attended regularly, but during the year 1910 the five absent boys attended 174 days on the average, the three present averaging in their attendances only 136. Of the five absent boys all were intelligent, and all had been present the previous week. Of the three boys present, one was supposed by both teachers to be the most stupid boy that ever entered the school—we spent much time and infinite pains in trying to get him to express his own name intelligibly. The boy who had just returned after a long period was a good boy, the third was maddling.

This standard was fully examined, and on its examination apparently depended Mr. Welpy's estimate of the junior division. I must say that I never got any useful help or suggestions, except from the principal though we had numerous inspectors and organisers.

(4) I showed a basin, towel, and soap, by request to an inspector who visited, yet he wrote on the same date in Observation Book, and the remark remains:—

"A wash-basin, towel, &c., should be provided." Mr. Welpy later in the year varies it by:—

"A basin, towel, soap, &c., should be provided." All were in use in the school.

(5) Mr. Welpy writes in Observation Book:—

"Miss Cleary should not put hands on children, or lead them to their places. The training of the junior pupils leaves a good deal to be desired."

I certainly was guilty of such atrocious conduct as regards the two infants already named, first entered on the rolls that day. Mr. Welpy did not show or suggest how it could have been managed otherwise.

(6) Mr. Welpy writes, 25-11-10:—

"These ought to be no writing and no drawing on the slates."

Seven months later, Mr. Welpy put into the hands of senior boys, who always used paper, a supply of slates to examine these classes in Mathematics.

(7) Mr. Welpy makes at least two misstatements regarding me in his unceasingly published at page 211 (second column) in first volume of evidence:—

(a) He says:—

"The Junior Assistant had refused to attend an Organiser's class."

This is not correct. I never refused. The marriage of my brother, which forced me at the time to remain at home, and which occurred the very week the course opened, prevented me reluctantly to absent myself from a month's course of Kindergarten instruction which was held at Cahin.

(b) As if to justify any supposed improvement in my work, a year later he writes (25-10-11):—

"She has done this (attended an Organiser's class, however, since)."

This also is untrue. I never attended any course after his first visit here. It is quite true that voluntarily I spent two sessions in studying Irish at the Munster College, Ballingarry, and expended at least £12 of my own salary thereon, and that with the Principal, I taught this subject—even to the Third Course—to the satisfaction of the Board's officers, and of Gaelic League Organisers, who at various times visited the school. The Principal told this to Mr. Welpy on the 23rd November, 1910—the date of his inspection here. I should have gone if it were possible for me, with equal readiness to the Kindergarten Course at Cahin. My inability in the one case is refused. My voluntary training at my own expense is ignored. I conclude that his action proves either hostility to Irish or unfairness to me, or both.

(8) In the first volume of Evidence (Appendix IX), page 201, Mr. Welpy writes:—

"Mr. Mansfield wrote me a long letter which I hold, setting forth certain circumstances for my consideration, with the object apparently of inducing me to alter my opinion expressed to him, that the school could not get more than 'Good.'"

Mr. Mansfield informed me on the evening of the examination that Mr. Welpy would not tell him the mark he was giving the school, that he would have to look up his notes and the written work first, but the Principal also stated that he would call immediately on the manager, and request him to write to the Board, asking for a re-examination of the school. I believe the inspector did not, as he asserts, tell the Principal what mark the school was getting. The Principal certainly expressed his views pretty strongly as to the unfairness of the whole proceeding. It was rather sinister to hold a second general inspection within seven months, and to alter the usual time for such—the spring or early summer—so the month arranged for the annual religious examination. As the Junior is now only the echo of the Senior Inspector, I do not blame Mr. Fitzgerald for supporting the Senior from whom in his marking he was not permitted to differ.

(Signed), JOHANNA CLEARY.

Cullen, Tipperary, 26-8-12.

APPENDIX LXIV.

HANDED IN BY MISS MAHON, PRESIDENT, I.N.T.O. PREPARED BY J. M'GRATH, B.A.,
KILMOVEE (1) B.N.S., BALLAGHADERREEN; DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE ON
CENTRAL COMMITTEE, I.N.T.O., FOR COUNTIES SLIGO, MAYO, AND GALWAY.

SUMMARY OF CASES OF LOWERING REPORTS.

SCHOOL.	Teacher.	Class.	Grade.	Service.	Training.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.
Lecternallen, Connemara, 13418.	Mrs. Healy ..	-	II.	Yes.	-	G. Mr. Young.	G. Mr. Smyth.	G. Mr. Cox.	G. Mr. Cox.
Onaght, Aran, 12342 ..	Mrs. Waters ..	-	III.	25	-	G. Mr. Young.	V.G. Mr. Smyth.	G. Mr. Cox.	G. Mr. Cox.
Ardmore, Carna, 10591	Mrs. Cahalane	-	II.	-	-	G. Mr. Smyth.	V.G. Mr. Cox.	V.G. Mr. Cox.	V.G. Mr. Cox.
Mount Bellew G., 15223	Miss Sheehy ..	-	III.	8	Yes.	-	-	-	V.G.
Kilconnell, Co. Galway	Mr. Sipple ..	P.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Annagh G., Co. Galway	Mrs. Lenaghan	II.	II.	26	Yes.	P.	P.	P.	P.
Fansee, 13579, Co. Clare	Mr. O'Shea ..	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Barnaberg, 14633 ..	Mr. O'Sullivan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Woodlawn, 13216 ..	Mrs. Cahill ..	II.	II.	30	Yes.	G.	G.	G.	V.G.
Gort, 16461	Mr. Brady ..	-	III.	-	-	-	-	-	G. Mr. Hoon.
Mount Bellew, 12362 ..	Mr. Kinnane ..	P.	P.	32	Yes.	E. Mr. Worsley.	V.G. Mr. Worsley.	V.G. Mr. Worsley.	V.G. Mr. Worsley.
Lentra, Co. Galway ..	Mr. Stanton..	II.	III.	22	Yes.	-	V.F. Mr. Smyth.	G. Mr. Worsley.	P. Mr. Worsley.
Ballyroe G., 13540 ..	Mrs. Comer ..	P.	P.	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ballyroe B., 13559 ..	Mr. Comer ..	P.	II.	23	Yes.	G. Mr. Smyth.	G. Mr. Worsley.	G. Mr. Worsley.	G. Mr. Worsley.
Ballyglass, 14642 ..	Mr. Numan ..	-	III.	5	Yes.	V.G. in previous schools, Co. Kerry.			

GALWAY CIRCUIT.

1906.	1907.	1908.	1909.	1910.	1911.	1912.	REMARKS.
F. Mr. Mahon.	G. Mr. Mahon.	V.G. Mr. Mahon.	G. Mr. Dalton.	G. Mr. Dalton.	F. Mr. Kelly.	—	Famous fever district. School used as fever hospital for six months, 1910. Open two months previous to examination, 1911. Result—Loss of promotion to 1 st Grade.
G. Mr. Egan.	G. Mr. Newell.	F. Mr. Fenton.	Mid. Mr. Mangan.	F. Mr. Kelly.	F. Mr. Kelly.	F. Mr. Kelly.	Placed in maximum of Grade III. salary in 1905. Reduction from G. to F. in 1908 blocked promotion to Grade II.
V.G. Mr. Dalton.	V.G. Mr. Dalton.	V.G. Mr. Shannon.	V.G. Mr. Morgan.	V.G. Mr. Dalton.	V.G. Mr. Kelly.	G. Mr. Kelly.	Bilingual programme introduced in 1908. Bilingual fees reduced in 1912.
G.	G. (Jan.) Mr. Dalton. Mid. (Nov.) Mr. Mahon.	F.	F. (May, '10)	Mid. (Oct.) Mr. Morgan.	Mid. (Oct.) Mr. Morgan.	Mid. Mr. Franklin.	Senior Inspector gives "G" in Jan., '07; Junior Inspector gives "Mid." in Nov., '07. Principal and assistant deprived of increment in 1910.
V.G.	V.G.	V.G.	—	F. (Mar., 1910) Mr. Kelly. V.G. (Oct.) Mr. Kelly.	—	—	Appealed after March Examination, 1910. Appeal refused. Report raised, Oct., 1910. Increment paid with arrears.
G.	G.	G.	G.	G. Mr. Dalton.	G. Mr. Cole.	F. Mr. Franklin.	Promoted to Grade II. from April, 1910. Increment due when mark reduced in 3rd year.
—	—	—	G. (June) Mr. Dalton.	F. (Oct., '09) Mr. Mahon.	G. Mr. Kelly.	—	Mark lowered to "F" by Junior, three months after Senior gave "G." Increment delayed for one year.
—	V.G. Mr. Shannon.	V.G. Mr. Shannon.	G. Mr. Dalton.	V.G. Mr. Morgan.	F. (Jan., '12) Mr. Connolly.	—	Mark lowered by Senior in increment year. Teacher complains of discourtesy and erratic conduct of Senior.
E.	G.	F.	Mid. Mr. Mahon. G. Mr. Mahon.	F. Mr. Kelly.	F. Mr. Kelly.	F. Mr. Connolly.	
G. Mr. Mahon.	G. Mr. Mahon.	G. Mr. Mahon.	G. Mr. Dalton.	G. Mr. Mahon.	F. Mr. Kelly.	—	Promotion to Grade II. due when mark was lowered in Nov., 1910. Teacher appealed. Appeal refused. Senior re-inspected. Erratic conduct of Senior complained of. No result from appeal so far.
V.G. Mr. Winstley.	V.G. Mr. Dalton.	G. Mr. Mahon.	G. Mr. Mahon.	G. Mr. Kelly.	G. Mr. Morgan.	G. Mr. Franklin.	Promotion to 1st division of Grade I. blocked, owing to lowering of reports since December, 1907.
G. Mr. Shannon.	G. Mr. Shannon.	F. Mr. Dalton.	G. Mr. Morgan.	G. Mr. Morgan.	G. Mr. Franklin.	G. Mr. Franklin.	Reduction of report in 1908, debared from promotion to Grade II. Average was then 35. It has not since reached that figure.
—	—	V.G. Mr. Dalton.	V.G. Mr. Morgan.	G. Mr. Morgan.	G. Mr. Franklin.	—	Promotion to Grade 1 st lost in 1910. Appeal not granted.
G. Mr. Shannon.	G. Mr. Shannon.	G. Mr. Dalton.	G. Mr. Morgan.	V.G. Mr. Morgan.	G. Messrs. Franklin and Connolly.	G. Mr. Franklin.	Report lowered in May, 1912, after re-inspection by Senior Inspector. Principal's work commended, but promotion to Grade 1 st denied.
—	—	—	—	F. (Nov.) Mr. Kelly.	G. Messrs. Kelly, Connolly, M'Neill.	F. Mr. Kelly.	In 1911, Mr. Kelly recommended "G." After eight months, Senior re-inspected. Chief came to decide, Jan., 1912. Three weeks afterwards mark again reduced to "F."

SUMMARY OF CASES OF LOWERING REPORTS.

School.	Teacher.	Class.	Grade.	Service.	Training.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.
Carrison, 12895, Co. Mayo	J. Marrow ..	P.	-	Yrs. 20	Yes.	-	G. Mr. Rogers.	G. Mr. Dewar.	G. Mr. Dewar.
Kilken, 13477 ..	Mr. McDonnell	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cernanool, 14497, Castlebar	Mr. Egan ..	-	II.	-	-	G.	G.	G.	G.
Burniscurra, 5756, Clonsilla	Mr. R. O'Connell	-	-	-	Yes.	-	-	-	-
Derrywash, 13152, Castlebar.	Mr. Reidy ..	-	-	-	Not.	F. Mr. O'Reilly.	G. Mr. MacMillan.	G. Mr. MacMillan.	G. Mr. MacMillan.
Cloggermugh, Castlebar ..	Mr. Hughes ..	-	-	25	Yes.	F. Mr. Smyth.	F. Mr. MacMillan.	F. Mr. MacMillan.	F. Mr. MacMillan.
St. Joseph's, 13657, Castlebar.	Mr. P. Jordan	-	-	30	Not.	G. Mr. M'Cheslock.	F. Mr. MacMillan.	Mid. Mr. MacMillan.	Mid. Mr. MacMillan.
Ladnall, 13633 ..	Mr. P. Egan ..	I.	-	-	Yes.	G.	G.	F.	G.
Leedsburgh, 5128 ..	Mr. O'Toole ..	P.	III.	26	Yes.	Assistant	for many years.		-
Luckhill, 4795, Castlebar	Mr. T. Reidy ..	II.	II.	36	Not.	G.	G. Mr. MacMillan.	G. Mr. MacMillan.	F. Mr. MacMillan.
Shanahan, 12887 ..	Mr. Moyles ..	-	II.	-	Yes.	-	-	G. Mr. MacMillan.	G. Mr. MacMillan.
Bofeld G., 14419, Ballina	Mrs. O'Leary	-	-	-	Yes.	G.	G.	G.	G.
Clelland, Newport ..	Mr. Kelly ..	-	-	30	Yes.	-	-	F.	F.
Aglish, Castlebar ..	Mr. McGreevy	-	-	40	-	F.	F.	F.	F.
Park, 13115, Castlebar	Mr. Maunton, B.A.	I.	III.	20	Yes.	Red. Mr. MacMillan.	F. Mr. O'Reilly.	G.	Mid. Mr. O'Reilly.
Sauls, 10938, Achill ..	Mr. E. M'Nulty (ex-teacher).	-	-	38	-	F.	F.	Mid. Mr. MacMillan.	Mid. Mr. MacMillan.

MAYO CIRCUIT.

1906.	1907.	1908.	1909.	1910.	1911.	1912.	Remarks.
G. Mr. O'Reilly.	G. Mr. O'Reilly.	G. Mr. O'Reilly.	F. Mr. Cussen.	F. Mr. Dale.	F. Mr. Dale.	F. Mr. Dale.	Got increments, 1903 and 1904. Promotion refused after 1903 report.
—	—	G. Mr. O'Reilly.	G. Mr. Cole.	G. Mr. Dale.	F. Mr. Cussen.	—	Report reduced at examination held 28th September, 1911, after five weeks' vacation.
G.	G.	G.	F. Mr. Cussen.	F. Mr. Cussen.	F. Mr. Cussen.	F. Mr. Cussen.	Got increments, 1903 and 1904. Promotion blocked after 1903.
—	—	—	G. Mr. Cole.	G. Mr. Fenton.	F. Mr. Cussen.	F. Mr. Fenton.	Increment blocked for one year. — G " in 1913.
F. Mr. MacMillan.	F. Mr. Duffy.	F. Mr. Duffy.	G. (Feb.) Mr. O'Neill.	F. (Nov. '09) Mr. Fenton.	G. Mr. Fenton.	—	No prospect of promotion.
G. Mr. MacMillan.	V.G. Mr. Duffy.	G. Mr. Doody.	G. (Jan. '10) Mr. Fenton.	F. (Aug.) Mr. Cussen.	F. Mr. Cussen.	—	No prospect of promotion.
Mid. Mr. MacMillan.	F. Mr. Duffy.	F. Mr. Duffy.	Mid. Mr. Cussen.	Mid. Mr. Fenton.	—	—	Salary withdrawn since April, 1912. Got "Good" in 1909, 1901 and 1902. Very harsh case.
F.	G.	G.	F. Mr. Cussen.	G. Mr. Dale.	G. Mr. Dale.	—	Teacher cannot secure promotion under present system of erratic marking in poverty-stricken district.
—	—	F. Mr. Duffy.	F. Mr. O'Neill.	Mid. Mr. Cussen.	Mid. Mr. Fenton.	F. Mr. Cussen.	Appealed against inspections by Messrs. Cussen and Fenton. Senior re-examined, and raised mark to "F."
G. Mr. MacMillan.	G. Mr. MacMillan.	Mid. Mr. Smyth.	F. Mr. Doody.	G. Mr. Fenton.	F. Mr. Fenton.	F. Mr. Fenton.	Increments obtained, 1903 and 1904. None since. Complaints of Mr. Cussen's observations at incidental visits.
F. Mr. MacMillan.	G. Mr. O'Reilly.	V.G. Mr. Smyth.	V.G. Mr. Fenton.	G. Mr. Dale.	G. Mr. Dale.	G. Mr. Dale.	Increment delayed one year after 1906 report. Promotion to Grade I. refused after inspection, Sept. 30th, 1909—six months after previous examination.
G.	V.G.	V.G.	V.G. Mr. Fenton.	V.G. Mr. Dale.	G. Mr. Dale.	G. Mr. Dale.	Teacher ill, 1911. School closed. Inspection held, and report lowered after re-opening after Easter Vacation. Promotions blocked.
F.	F.	F.	F. Mr. Fenton.	Mid. Mr. Cussen.	—	G. Mr. M'Neill.	Teacher appealed against Mr. Fenton. Mr. Cussen reduced mark to "Mid." on re-examination. On re-appeal, Messrs. Fenton and M'Neill raised mark to "Good." Teacher complains of long course of punishment.
Mod.	F.	F.	F.	F.	F.	F.	Withdrawal of salary threatened after 1904 examination. One year probation allowed. Practically forced out in 1913, on small pension.
F.	Mid. Mr. Chambers.	F.	F.	Mid. Mr. Cussen.	F.	F.	Salary reduced P. to II. class in 1901. Fined £5 in 1903. Reprimanded in 1904. Teacher protested. Mr. Chambers re-examined, and reduced mark to "Mid." Salary reduced by £28 per annum. Appealed in 1910. No result.
Bad. Mr. Chambers.	Bad. Mr. Chambers.	F. Mr. Smyth.	F. Mr. Fenton.	Bad. Mr. Maegan.	Bad. Mr. Fenton.	—	Teacher complains of unfair treatment by Messrs. MacMillan and Chambers, because of Irish and night schools. Practically forced out after 34 years' service, on £22 per annum pension. Local poverty and peculiar conditions not taken into account.

SUMMARY OF CASES OF LOWERING OF

School.	Teacher.	Class.	Grade.	Service.	Training.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.
Shandurighan, 12646, Co. Galway.	Miss O'Malley (ex-teacher)	II.	-	Yes.	-	Teacher	was dismissed owing	to unfavourable	
Mullinahone, 1830, Co. Waterford.	Mr. Delaney—P. Mr. Murphy—A.	II. ¹ III.	III. III.	14 36	Yes. Not.	G. —	F. —	G. —	G. —
Mullinahone G., 2537, Co. Waterford.	Miss Shanahan	—	III.	18	—	G.	G.	F.	G.
Ardmore, 10591, Connemara.	Mrs. Cahalane	—	II.	—	—	G.	V.G.	V.G.	V.G.
Inver, 12648, Belmullet ..	Mr. J. Caulfield	I ¹	I ²	—	Yes.	G.	G.	G.	G.
Shesh, 18073, Ballinrobe	Mr. Rabbitt ..	—	II.	29	Not.	G.	F.	G.	G.
Gortahork, Donegal ..	Mr. P. Carr ..	I ¹	II.	30	—	—	—	—	—
Cullen B., Co. Cork ..	Mr. Kiely ..	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

REPORTS IN BILINGUAL SCHOOLS.

1906.	1907.	1908.	1909.	1910.	1911.	1912.	REMARKS.
made reports in 1903.	—	—	—	—	—	—	The school was efficient, and the teacher got favourable reports till 1903-5. In 1904 a Special Bilingual Programme was introduced and sanctioned by the Board. Mr. McMillan, who was looked on in the West as notoriously opposed to Irish, insisted on judging the Merit by the English standard.
G.	G. Dr. Shoffington.	G. Dr. Shoffington.	Mid. Mr. Mangan.	Mid. Mr. Mangan.	F. Mr. Mangan.	—	Bilingual Programme enforced by Board, 1-7-04, against wishes of manager and teachers. The latter had no qualifications in Bilingual teaching—merit mark lowered. No bilingual fees paid in 1909 or 1910. Promotion for Principal to Grade II. was blocked. The Assistant after 36 years' service threatened with withdrawal of salary unless he acquired a bilingual certificate before 30-6-'13.
G.	G.	G.	F. Mr. Banahan.	(1909-10) Mr. Banahan.	F. Mr. Mangan.	F. Mr. Mangan.	Bilingual Programme introduced, as in boys' school, 1-7-'10. Teacher unqualified in bilingual methods. In March, 1912, Board threatened to consider Miss Shanahan's recognition unless she became competent to conduct a bilingual school by 30-9-'12. She tried, but failed. No salary forthcoming January, 1913.
V.G.	V.G.	V.G.	V.G.	V.G.	V.G. Mr. Kelly.	G. Mr. Kelly.	Bilingual grant reduced for 1912 because of lowering of merit mark.
G.	G.	G. Mr. Duffy.	G. Mr. Fenton.	F. Mr. Fenton.	F. Mr. Fenton.	F. Mr. Fenton.	Bilingual Programme introduced 1908. Fees for bilingual teaching reduced, 1910-'11-'12.
G.	G.	G.	G.	G.	G.	F.	Manager appealed in 1912. Mr. Casson, sen., unable to adjudge merit in bilingual school. Justice has, I believe, since been done.
—	G. Mr. Little.	F. Mr. Little.	G. Mr. Little.	F. Mr. Little.	F.	F. Mr. Mangan.	Bilingual since 1908. School small.—Local conditions unfavourable. Teacher's work and intelligence praised. Promotion to Grade II blocked. Bilingual fees reduced or blocked.
—	—	G. Mr. Lehane.	G. Mr. Lehane.	G. Mr. Lehane.	F. Mr. Lehane.	— Messrs. Pedlow Mangan.	Bilingual Programme introduced 1907, at request of people and manager. It was disallowed after June, 1911, as a result, the teacher asserts, of unfair methods of examination and inspection by Mr. Mangan.

APPENDIX LXV.

(Headed in by Mr. C. H. Todd, Principal, Ballymacreagh Road N.S., Belfast.)

Extract from pamphlet entitled "Inspection of Schools and Promotion of Teachers. Exposure of Present System."

TABLES showing the cumulative financial penalties inflicted on teachers, B, C, and D for 1, 2, and 3 inferior reports in the course of their official careers:—

Years of service.	A's grade salary.	B's grade salary.	B's loss.	C's grade salary.	C's loss.	D's grade salary.	D's loss.
1	£ 50	£ 50	—	£ 50	—	£ 56	—
2	50	50	—	50	—	56	—
3	50	50	—	50	—	56	—
4	60	56	7	56	7	63	—
5	63	63 ^(a)	—	56	7	63	—
6	63	63	—	63	—	63	—
7	70	63	7	63	7	63	7
8	70	70	—	63	7	70 ^(c)	—
9	70	70	—	70	—	70	—
10	77	70	7	70	7	70	7
11	77	77	—	70	7	77	—
12	77	77	—	77	—	77	—
13	87	77	10	77	10	77	10
14	87	87	—	77	10	77	10
15	87	87	—	87	—	87 ^(d)	—
16	97	87	10	87	10	87	10
17	97	97	—	87	10	87	10
18	97	97	—	97	—	97	—
19	107	97	10	97	10	97	10
20	107	107	—	97	10	97	10
21	107	107	—	107	—	107	—
22	117	107	10	107	10	107	10
23	117	117	—	107	10	107	10
24	117	117	—	117	—	117	—
25	127	117	10	117	10	117	10
26	127	127	—	117	10	117	10
27	127	127	—	127	—	127	—
28	139	127	12	127	12	127	12
29	139	139	—	127	12	127	12
30	139	139	—	139	—	127	12
31	161	139	12	139	12	127	24
32	161	161	—	139	12	127	24
33	161	161	—	161	—	127	24
34	163	161	12	161	12	127	36
35	163	163	—	161	12	127	36
36	163	163	—	163	—	127	36
37	175	163	12	163	12	127	48
38	175	175	—	163	12	139 ^(e)	36
39	175	175	—	175	—	139	36
40	175	175	—	175	—	139	36
41	175	175	—	175	—	139	36
42	175	175	—	175	—	151	24
43	175	175	—	175	—	151	24
44	175	175	—	175	—	151	24
45	175	175	—	175	—	151	24
Totals ..	—	—	119	—	238	—	680

"Forty-five years' service is reckoned, so that a teacher beginning at 20 years of age will be 65 on retirement."

"A's case represents what happens when no inferior reports are furnished against the teacher during his professional career, provided his school has the qualifying attendance."

"(a) B's first increment, £7, is paid a year later than A's, resulting in a net loss of £119 during his official career, although he is never afterwards retarded in promotion or increment."

"(b) C does not receive his first increment until his 8th year of service, and, although he is never subsequently retarded in promotion or increment, yet he loses £238 as compared with A."

"(c) D's second increment is delayed by an inferior report until his 8th year of service; consequently,

during the first 13 years of service, he receives £24 less than A."

"(d) D's first promotion (i.e., to 2nd grade) is retarded until his 15th year of service, so that he loses £114 in addition to the previous £24, making a total loss of £138 as compared with A in the first 20 years."

"(e) D received promotion (without increment) to 1st division of first grade in his 36th year of service (age 56 years), but is notified by the Commissioners of National Education that no increase of salary attaches to his promotion, and it is not until his 38th year of service that the increase is awarded; thus he loses a further £24 as compared with A, and his total relative loss, owing to delays during his 45 years of service amounts to the very large sum of £430 (i.e., £14 per year.)"

The Committee also determined to attempt to obtain a census of the reduction of reports in the two circuits for the years 1904-5. For this purpose they approached the managers of the various denominations, with the result given below. The E.C., Pres., and Methodist managers agreed to help, but although the E.C. Bishop was approached, he did not respond. The Methodists issued a circular and received replies from schools, but did not send to the secretary of the Committee a summary of the information received. The Rev. Dr. Bingham and the Rev. A. S. Woodward most willingly assisted, and gave available aid, and the following is the result

of their labours, showing the number of reductions during 1907-8 as compared with 1904-5:—

* Presbyterian schools	158 returns received
of these	74 had report reduced in mark
giving	46·8 percentage of reduction
C. I. schools	99 returns received
of these	47 had report reduced in mark
giving	47·4 percentage of reduction ¹

¹ There are 702 schools in Belfast circuits (1) and (2), and returns have been obtained by Revs. A. S. Woodward and Dr. Bingham from only 257 of these.

INDEX.

A.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department,
Inspectors :

Difference in mode of procedure from inspectors
under National Board, *Smyth*, 17825-7; *Carter*,
17880-7.

Reports have no effect on salaries, *Smyth*, 17845-7
Agriculture, see under School Programme.

Alexander, Dr.

Interference with teacher's methods, case,
MacSwiney, .. 22337-8

Marking of :

Anglin School, *MacSwiney*, .. 21076

Bleasington Boys' School, *Lenders*, .. 21075

Dolphin's Barn Girls' School, *MacSwiney*,
21061-21049

Glencaly School, *MacSwiney*, .. 22136

Allen, Mrs.—

Instance of adopting one inspector's methods, and
then finding that they were repudiated, *Mac-
Swiney*, .. 22254-63

ANDERSON, WILLIAM, Principal of Danover
National School, County Down : 18064-18313

No Complaint as to new system of grading, 18135

Personal career, .. 18066-71

Appeals :

Attitude to be taken both by Board and teachers,
question of, *Makes*, .. 22535-46

Balfour, interpretation of right as teachers in
reference to, *Todd*, .. 18278-97

Board's rule worthless and misleading, *Makes*,
22548-9

Board should be divided into Sub-committees, and
question of relation to Office Committee, *Makes*,
22790-329

Cases of refusal, *MacSwiney*, .. 22228

Concerning individual teachers involving re-
imposition, question of reaching Commissioners,
Davis, .. 22476-05

not Conducted on right lines, *Todd*, 18370-3

Condemned teachers should be granted, in any case,
Makes, .. 22094-13

no Confidence in Department, and investigation
by some authority independent of inspectors in
charge of district named, *MacSwiney*, 22040-78

Dismissal without grievance removed by Irish
National Teachers' Association, *Elliot*, 18386-95

ON DISMISSAL :

Cases and particulars, *MacSwiney*, 22070-502

Change in rules does not give complete defence,
and reason and case, *Elliot*, 16002-7

Employment of substitute should be allowed to
teachers, *Todd*, .. 15375

Every teacher should have right of, against un-
satisfactory report, *Carter*, 17588-9; *Makes*,
20781-5; *Makes*, 22842.

Gortnagowna School refused, and particulars,
Papery, 19353-8, 19380, 19410-25, 19446-52

Granted as matter of favour in rare cases where
manager is strong-minded or determined, *Makes*,
22558

should be heard and considered by whole Board
and re-examination by higher official granted,
Makes, .. 22842

Inquiry should be open, *Todd*, .. 18376-91

Mahoonagh School, particulars, *O'Callaghan*,
20840-30

should not be Matter of favour through influence
of individual Commissioners, *Makes*, .. 22647

Mardyke School refused, and particulars, *Swiney*,
19625-7, 19684, 19078-9, 19732-4

Made before and after new system, and new rules
limit teachers, *Elliot*, .. 17214-21

Appeals—continued.

Meekagh School, refused and particulars, *Mac-
Swiney*, .. 22133-4

Necessity would be largely done away with if
increased and promotion did not depend on
inspectors' reports, *Anderson*, .. 18204

Numbers are
multiplied by extensions of rights, *Carter*,
17586-94

Procedure by Irish National Teachers' Association,
Elliot, .. 18942-4

Procedure suggested, *Makes*, .. 22831-2

Question why teachers do not appeal when dis-
satisfied with result of inspection, *Carter*,
17456-64

Rarely refused before 1900, *Makes*, .. 22535

Refused independent of school or district advan-
ced, *Grogg*, .. 18426-3

Refused for decision to very person whose decision
was appealed against, and case, *MacSwiney*,
22248-34, *Makes*, 22335

Refused suggested might be higher official of Board,
but should be in no way connected with circuit,
Anderson, .. 18228-35

Reports lowered two steps by Mr. Welply refused,
MacSwiney, .. 21813-4

Rule modified by Commissioners by private regula-
tion, *Elliot*, .. 17261-8

should be Satisfactory court of, and not only from
junior to senior inspector, *Smyth*, 17816-4, 17841,
Anderson, 18199

Shewardagh Girls' School, *Berry*,
20400-7

should be on sworn evidence, *Todd*,
15374, 15380-79

Statement of Mr. Dillworth that appointment of
Mr. Ward gave teachers additional means of
access to Board, reply to, *Makes*, .. 22547

Teachers afraid of being punished, *Anderson*, 18337

Tullymore School, particulars, *Anderson*,
18160-21, 18288-303, 18294

Uselessness of, *Grogg*, 18302, 18426-5; *Anderson*,
18226; *O'Callaghan*, 16029; *Overs*, 19256-65;
MacSwiney, 21040-76; *Makes*, 22335.

Ardenmore School, Cashed, principal Teacher, increas-
ment delayed owing to lowering of report on account
of assistant teacher, *Makes*, .. 20608-78

Ardishan School, delayed report, instance, *Makes*,
22528

Arithmetic, see under School Programme.

Article School, case instanced as showing teacher
was taken at disadvantage at time of inspection
and that due allowance was not made, *Bowen*,
20098-4

Anglin School, merit marks, particulars, *Mac-
Swiney*, .. 21072-3

B.

Balfour, Gerald, deprivation of Teachers' Organisation
committed to proceed to London to interview,
but inability to prevent grievances, *Makes*,
22180, 22187, 22187-7

Ballyhazare School :

Dismissal of teacher, particulars, *MacSwiney*,
22800-2

Lowering of report following visit of Dr. Starke,
MacSwiney, 22189-92, 22163-4

Ballygreen School, instance of teacher adopting one
inspector's methods then finding they were repudi-
ated, *MacSwiney*, .. 22234-63

Ballydrain School, merit mark awarded to, par-
ticulars, *Grogg*, .. 18435-6

Ballymacarret Road School, see under Belfast.

Ballyvaughan School, merit marks, particulars, *Todd*,
14993-2

Ballyvaughan School, instance of injustice of inspection,
Makes, .. 20730-53

Bannon, Mr.:

Helpful suggestions made, Quinn,	20372-3
MARKING OF:	
Kilmore School, <i>O'Flanagan</i> ,	19960
Rathkevin School, <i>Quinn</i> ,	20002
Rosengreen School, <i>Keenan</i> ,	20134, 20136
Tamponage School, <i>O'Grady</i> ,	19960
Barrowby School, dismissal of teacher, particulars,	
<i>Macdonald</i> ,	22061-135
BARRY, PATRICK, Principal of Sherrard's	
Boys' School, County Tipperary:	20457-595
Curriculum,	20457-59
Grades and loss of increment owing to paper pro-	
visions,	20576-81
Unsettled remuneration,	20592-4
Bateman, Mr., marking of Anghrim School, <i>Mac-</i>	
<i>Sweryn</i> ,	21074

Beatty, Dr.:

Illustrations of marking by, <i>Rossney</i> ,	20998
Reports on Ballymacarrett Road School, Belfast,	
<i>Todd</i> ,	20251

Belfast:

BALLYMACARRETT ROAD SCHOOL:	
Absence of principal teacher on degradation on	
occasion of inspector's visit, explanation,	
<i>Todd</i> ,	15108-9
Case of cleaning and upkeep of school being	
borne by teachers, <i>Stiff</i> ,	16211-6
Duals, provision of, particulars and investiga-	
tion, <i>Todd</i> ,	15106-12
Inaccuracy of Mr. Homan in marking a subject	
not taught, <i>Todd</i> ,	15281-6
Inadequacy of building, <i>Todd</i> ,	15691-3
Injustice owing to examination having taken	
place early in uniform school year, <i>Todd</i> ,	15129-43
Mark lowered on account of premises, <i>Todd</i> ,	15097-105
Nothing contributed to upkeep by manager,	
<i>Todd</i> ,	15471-81
Overcrowding, and attendance reduced by order	
of National Board, <i>Todd</i> ,	14940-6, 15483-514, 15234-9
Ownership question, <i>Todd</i> ,	15193-3
Reports and merit marks, particulars, <i>Todd</i> ,	
15251-2, 15292-73	
Statement re, put in report of Belfast deputation,	
part left out, <i>Todd</i> ,	15250-3
Statement made by Mr. Homan re, should have	
been put in Observation Book, <i>Todd</i> ,	15435-41, 15626-65
Statement that one lady teacher had charge of	
100 pupils in attendance, inaccurate, <i>Todd</i> ,	15214-31
Mr. Todd accused of altering Observation Book	
<i>Todd</i> ,	15065-80
MARION STREET SCHOOL:	
Average, <i>Jameson</i> ,	17906
Merit marks awarded, and particulars, <i>Jameson</i> ,	17907-18048
Observation book, unsuited for remarks made	
in, <i>Jameson</i> ,	17928-32, 18059-42
Three assistants, <i>Jameson</i> ,	17997
ORMEAU ROAD SCHOOL:	
Effect of results of inspection on extra subjects,	
<i>Carter</i> ,	17406-21, 17423-8
Expenses for cleaning and heating partly borne	
by teacher, <i>Carter</i> ,	17540-60, 17575-9
Observation Book, complaint as to observations	
in, <i>Carter</i> ,	17423-5
Suggestions of vague character as to be practi-	
cally useless, <i>Carter</i> ,	17429-31
Site, <i>Carter</i> ,	17167
RAVENSCROFT SCHOOL:	
Injustice owing to examination taking place	
early in school year, <i>Todd</i> ,	15125-4
Manager works in concert with teacher for	
upkeep, <i>Boyd</i> ,	15730-30
Observation Book, no commendation in, <i>Boyd</i> ,	15792
Particular attention received from inspectors	
since Belfast deputation, <i>Boyd</i> ,	15702, 15865-6

Belfast—continued.

RAVENSCROFT SCHOOL—continued.	
Reduction of number on rolls, ordered, and	
particulars, <i>Boyd</i> ,	15792
"Teach," question, <i>Boyd</i> ,	15933-64
St. JAMES' ANTERIM ROAD SCHOOL:	
Manager has been doing best to get equipment,	
<i>Learmonth</i> ,	16416-22
Merit marks, particulars, <i>Learmonth</i> ,	16442-78,
16703	
Observation Book, extracts, <i>Learmonth</i> ,	16703
no Overcrowding, <i>Learmonth</i> ,	16810-12
Promises taken into account in awards of merit	
marks, <i>Learmonth</i> ,	16625-73, 16777, 16742,
16760-6, 16815, 16822-3, 16827-9	
Reply to inspectors' observations, <i>Learmonth</i> ,	16714-81, 16790-809
School premises owned by members of congrega-	
tion, <i>Learmonth</i> ,	16815
Voluntary contributions towards upkeep and	
improvement, <i>Learmonth</i> ,	16679-8
STDENHAM SCHOOL:	
Expenditure on materials and requisites, <i>Grogg</i> ,	18349-51
Informal appeal made against marking, <i>Grogg</i> ,	18364-74, 18402-3
Merit Marks, particulars re, <i>Grogg</i> ,	18326-438, 18443-327
Money raised locally for upkeep and equipment,	
<i>Grogg</i> ,	18345-51
New building being erected, and position, <i>Grogg</i> ,	18354-8, 18400-1
Number on roll and average attendance, <i>Grogg</i> ,	18341-2
Observation Book, particulars re remarks written	
in, <i>Grogg</i> ,	18375-8
Promises had and over-averaged, <i>Grogg</i> ,	18393-9
Belfast Circuit:	
Action ultimately taken on own initiative, <i>Todd</i> ,	15410-12, 15533-4
Appeal, interpretation of right as teachers in	
reference to, <i>Todd</i> ,	15273-97
DEPUTATION:	
Date of beginning of movement, <i>Todd</i> ,	16052-4
Inspectors present at, and had privilege of asking	
questions, <i>Todd</i> ,	15378-99
Manner in which complaint was received and	
treated officially, <i>Learmonth</i> ,	15709
Objections made on teachers, teachers should	
have been given opportunity of replying,	
<i>Todd</i> ,	15351-61
Received by Resident Commissioner on Febru-	
ary 6th, 1911, <i>Todd</i> ,	14945
Statement in reply to observations of Chief	
Inspectors, <i>Boyd</i> , 15773-91; <i>Learmonth</i> ,	15707-12.
INSPECTORS:	
Fall in marking considered due to secret in-	
structions to, from Beard, <i>Todd</i> ,	15915-20,
15967-9, 15973-83; <i>Boyd</i> , 15725-82.	
Relation with teachers deplorably bad, <i>Boyd</i> ,	15871
Removal because of marking too soft, question,	
<i>Boyd</i> ,	15928-32
Removal to other circuits advocated, <i>Mahon</i> ,	22918-40
MERIT MARKS:	
Fall in marking considered due to secret in-	
structions to inspectors from Beard, <i>Todd</i> ,	15915-20, 15967-9, 15973-83; <i>Boyd</i> , 15725-82,
no Fall in efficiency of teachers corresponding to,	
<i>Boyd</i> , 15933; <i>Todd</i> , 14965-82, 14965-4, 14972-	
15014, 15029-31, 15293-311, 15401-4, 15406-	
7; <i>Boyd</i> , 15715-42, 15760-8, 15934; <i>Learmonth</i> ,	
16633-5, 16695-6.	
Mr. Rynes considered root of evil, but not	
opinion personally, <i>Todd</i> ,	15021-8
Injustice having arisen from examination taking	
place early in uniform school year, <i>Todd</i> ,	15125-6, 15439-43
Laziness of marking prior to 1906, because	
program was new to teachers, question of,	
<i>Todd</i> ,	15032-7

Belfast Circuit—continued.

Merit Marks—continued.

- Lowering believed to be mainly due to fact that promises were now being taken into consideration, *Larneur*, 14697; *Todd*, 15088-124
 no Redress given to teachers in cases where mark was raised on re-inspection, *Boyd*, 15040-5, 15045-6
 meet Reductions than statistics showed known of, where teachers refused to sign because they thought they would be punished afterwards, *Todd*, 14967-8
 Removal of Inspector because of marking too soft, *question*, *Boyd*, 15038-32
 Rise in marking alleged by chief inspectors to be due to recent appointment of junior assistant mistresses, and reply, *Todd*, 15232-4
 Reports of inspectors from year 1901 on whole two circuits provided over by six inspectors handed in, *Larneur*, 15098, 15830-1

SCHOOLS:

- Catholic, more than sufficient accommodation in, *Todd*, 15561-5
 Forty-seven reduced, *Todd*, 14935-38, 14972
 15914, 15929-31, 15938-311, 15491-4, 15495-7; *Boyd*, 15715-49, 15766-8, 15934; *Larneur*, 15683-5, 15695-6
 Lack of accommodation, and School Attendance Act therefore of very little use, *Todd*, 15097-9
 Number of children who cannot find school places, *Todd*, 15332-45
 111 out of 404 schools protested, *Larneur*, 15685
 Ownership of teachers, *question*, *Todd*, 15584-91

Re-inspection:

- Looked upon as a farce by teachers, *Todd*, 15535-69
 Plan suggested by teachers for, *Todd*, 15238-44, 15691-72
 no Redress given to teachers in cases where mark was raised on, *Boyd*, 15940-5, 15943-9
 Reply to statement of chief inspectors that teachers would not select number of, for examination, *Todd*, 15235
 Rules entitling to have whole of 111 schools investigated, *question*, *Boyd*, 15946-7, 15984-9
 of Whole of schools expected as result of memorial and deputation, *Larneur*, 15687-94
 Statement by Mr. Deane that there was no effective teaching in, *Todd*, 15690-72, 15261-7, 15694-6, 15274; *Boyd*, 15769-72
See also particular cases of schools.

TEACHERS:

- Chief Inspector's re-inspection looked upon as a farce, *Todd*, 15535-69
 Chief Inspectors' views as to efficiency, *Todd*, 15274-7
 had Considered necessity for making representations about grievances for some time, *Todd*, 14949-50
 Description of Belfast as a storm centre, *question* of, *Boyd*, 15891-3
 Failure of to appeal, *question* of, *Boyd*, 15887-70
 Leniency of marking prior to 1904, because programme was new to, *question* of, *Todd*, 15035-7
 more Reductions than statistics showed teachers known, who refused to sign because they thought they would be punished afterwards, *Todd*, 14967-8
 Reason for not accepting Dr. Starke's offer, *Todd*, 15498-9
 no Redress given to teachers in cases where mark was raised on re-inspection, *Boyd*, 15940-5, 15948-9
 Regarded as cream of profession some years ago, and due to fact that owing to greater attractiveness of salaries, men drawn from all parts of Ireland, *Todd*, 15073-87
 Relations with inspectors deplorably bad, *Boyd*, 15571
 Reply to statement of chief inspectors that teachers would not select number of schools for examination, *Todd*, 15235
 Striving to meet requirements of new programme, *Larneur*, 15690-2
 Belfast National Teachers' Association, a branch of the Irish National Teachers' Association, *Elliot*, 15767-12

Birrell, Right Hon. Augustine, M.P.:

- Power over Board, *question* of, *Mohun*, 22540-28
 Stated by Dr. Starke to have done civil rights' question more harm than good, *Mohun*, 23374, 25090-4
 Statement of, understood to have included Mr. Mansfield's case in inquiry, and *question* of, *Mohun*, 22943-57
 Birmingham Boys' School, merit marks, particularly, *Larneur*, 15072-113

Board of National Education.

- Access to, protect against refusal of, at Waterford Congress, *Mohun*, 23322
 Agenda, all cases of dismissal placed upon, and *question* of discussion, *Deane*, 23441-52
 Anonymous charges against teachers investigated, *Mansfield*, 21630-6; *Mohun*, 22672-89, 23515-22
 Anonymous document re grouping, censure of Chief of Inspection for criticising, *Mansfield*, 21585-92
 Appeals should be heard and considered by whole, *Mohun*, 22942
 Appeals to, see that title.
 Assistance with regard to salaries, *Mohun*, 23317-21
 Case of inspector charging teacher with discourtesy and censure of teacher by, and manner of investigation of matter, *Deane*, 23924-9
 Chief of Inspection, censure for criticism of anonymous document re grouping, *Mansfield*, 21585-92

CIRCULARS:

- Conference should be held before issuing, *Elliot*, 15747
 Continued in force without ever appearing in rules, *Elliot*, 15697
 Corporal punishment, *Elliot*, 15697-8, 17018-45
 Referring to incidents alleged at Sligo Congress, *Mohun*, 23361-8
 as a Rule not seen by teachers, *Boyd*, 15892-90
 Rules made by, independently of rules set forth in code, *Elliot*, 15260-1
 "Tone," *Crewe*, 14847-50, 14857-67; *Todd*, 15594-6
 Unfavourable to teachers, *Elliot*, 15692
 Closure to teachers at date of introduction of changes, *Mohun*, 23240-1

COMMISSIONERS:

- Approached individually by Irish National Teachers' Association in bad cases, *Elliot*, 15943-4
 Blame put on Treasury for 12 years for financial wrongs to teachers before appointment of Committee, *Mohun*, 23507
 Estranged relations with teachers, several cases, *Mohun*, 23250
 Resident, see that title below.
 Complaints of lowering of reports all round by Mr. Cole ignored by, and *question* as to responsibility for calling attention to, *Mansfield*, 21810-39
 Concessions to teachers won without any practical help from, *Mohun*, 23069-128
 Conference with inspectors and managers should be held, *Mohun*, 22832
 Conference between representatives of, and intermediate schools and of managers and teachers of schools of all denominations over *question* of scholarships from national to intermediate schools, *Elliot*, 15939
 Consisted neither teachers nor managers on introduction of new scheme, *Mansfield*, 21578-81
 Correspondence with teachers not admitted unless vouched by manager, *Mansfield*, 21629-39
 Delays in sending out reports from office, *Mansfield*, 21601-6

DEPUTATIONS:

- Belfast:
 Date of beginning of movement, *Todd*, 15932-4
 Inspectors present at, and had privilege of asking questions, *Todd*, 15378-89
 Manner in which complaint was received and treated officially, *Larneur*, 15709
 Observations made on teachers, teachers should have been given opportunity of replying, *Todd*, 15341-91
 Received by Resident Commissioner on February 6th, 1911, *Todd*, 14963
 Statement in reply to observations of Chief Inspectors, *Boyd*, 15775-81; *Larneur*, 15767-12

Board of National Education—continued.

Deputations—continued.

- from Colonial teachers not received, *Moss*,
Field, ... 23134
 Docking of pay for each day serving on,
Mahon, ... 23454-58
 Irish National Teachers' Organisation:
 Board should at all times be accessible, *Mahon*,
 23553-61
 after Deputation to Mr. Balfour refused,
Mahon, ... 23517-8
 to Fall Board in 1912, *Mahon*, ... 23490-5
 on General questions and only in one instance
 or so with particular case, *Elliot*, 18885-8
 Joint deputation with Gaelic League, particu-
 lars, *Mahon*, ... 23373-4
 re Maternity rule received nominally by whole
 Board, *Elliot*, 18946-51; *Mahon*, 23084-8,
 Received by Dr. Starke, *Elliot*,
 18874-9, 18887, 16959
 not Received by any other members of Board
 than Dr. Starke, *Elliot*, ... 16881
 Refusal of Dr. Starke to receive certain
 members of Organisation, and reason,
Elliot, 16000-5; *Mahon*, 23297-309, 23309,
 Refused hearing by Dr. Starke, *Mahon*,
 23180, 23210-34
 Dr. Starke's private Secretary, and sometimes
 one of Secretaries present, *Elliot*, 16882-3
 Verbatim Report, 1909, inadvertent omission
 of marking "private and confidential"
 particulars, *Mahon*,
 23427-50, 23509-72, 23548-9

DIRECTOR AND SUB-DIRECTOR:

- Appointment in place of Resident Commissioner
 desired, *Mahon*, ... 22781
 should be on Office Committee, *Mahon*, 22788
 Dismissal of Mr. Mansfield, particulars, *Dess*,
 22341-403, 22450
 should be Divided into Sub-committees, and ques-
 tion of relation to Office Committee, *Mahon*,
 22790-829
 Exact copy of report in Observation Book by
 Cusbon paper, one to be sent to, would satisfy
 teachers, *Fidd*, ... 15423-41
 Examiners, men having practical experience should
 be put in place of, *Mansfield*, ... 21605
 Financial Secretary should be on Office Committee,
Mahon, ... 22788
 Grant for heating and cleaning schools, see under
 Schools.
 Incompetency, statement by Dr. Starke, *Dess*,
 22406-7
 Information asked for re making of schools in
 Circuit 18 refused, *Mansfield*, ... 21677
 Inspectors, see that title.
 Letter to "Irish Independent" from Mr. Mac-
 Sweeney, grave reflections stated to have been
 made upon administration, and particulars,
MacSweeney, ... 21691-22049
 Mal-administration, *Mahon*, ... 23484-7
 Memorialized by Colonial teachers, *Mansfield*,
 21796-7
 Objection to, as at present constituted, *Elliot*,
 17226-9
 Office administration, cost of, *Mansfield*, 21404-71
 OFFICE COMMITTEE:
 Constitution suggested, *Mahon*, ... 22781-06
 Relation to Sub-committees, question of, *Mahon*,
 22709-829
 Only body hostile to Irish National Teachers'
 Association, *Mahon*, ... 23083
 no Power on part of Chief Inspectors to criticize
 policy, *Mansfield*, ... 21563-7
 Power taken away from, as whole, and placed in
 hands of Dr. Starke, *Mansfield*, ... 21671
 Privileged letter to, stating that opinion of teachers
 was that Mr. Wedpy was qualifying for Chief
 Inspectorship, unfavourable on part of Mr. Hynes,
 and particulars, *Mansfield*, ... 21436-41
 Reference suggested in case of appeals might be
 higher official, *Anderson*, ... 16228-35
 Relations of Teachers' Organisation with, *Mahon*,
 23590-11

REPORTS—ANNUAL:

- on sale, but not generally known to teachers,
Mahon, ... 22609-23

Board of National Education—continued.

Reports—Annual—continued.

- no Teachers be recommended for promotion
 whose school is not above reproach in point
 of sanitation, *Mansfield*, ... 21558-62
 Representatives of teachers should at all times
 have free and friendly access to, *Mahon*, 22832
 Requires to be reformed and personnel of adminis-
 tration changed, and suggestion, *Mahon*,
 22754-229
 RESIDENT COMMISSIONER:
 Abolition of office desired, *Mahon*, ... 22781
 must have been aware even before memorial of
 state of affairs in Tipperary, *Mansfield*,
 21781-3
 Deputations, see that title above.
 Secret instructions from, considered cause of
 lowered marks in Belfast, *Fidd*, 15725-32;
Fidd, 15915-20, 15957-9, 16573-83.
 Individual corresponding to, in Scotland, ques-
 tion, *Esler*, ... 16243-7
 Private Secretary usually present at deputations,
Elliot, ... 16892-3
 Sole control placed in hands of, *Mansfield*,
 21762-7; *Mahon*, 23183-36, 23248-50.
 Specially responsible for inspectional grievances of
 teachers under system, *Mahon*, ... 22511
 See also Starke, W. J. M., M.A.
 no Respect for vested rights of teachers, *Mansfield*,
 21496-336
 not Responsible to public opinion nor to Parlia-
 ment, *Mansfield*, ... 21471-2
 Returns to Parliament of Dismissals of teachers,
 false returns, *Mansfield*, 21480-0, 21575-6
 Rules and regulations:
 of Administration secret, *Mahon*, 22996-625
 Check on, an intellectual safeguard, *Elliot*, 16967
 of Code and administration so far as affect
 interests of teachers should be published,
Mahon, ... 22658-64
 of Code published, *Mahon*, ... 22598
 Constant changes, *Elliot*, ... 17158-68
 Discussed to show that Board has not displayed
 any great capacity or competence in the
 making of, *Elliot*, ... 16996-17908
 Extracts from proposed new, appeared in news-
 papers in July, 1909, *Mahon*, 23180, 23187
 Fundamental, should not be changed without
 sanction of Lord Lieutenant, *Elliot*, 17188-41
 should be Laid on table of House of Commons
 for 40 days, *Mahon*, ... 22964-86
 Latest edition, hypocritical nature of changes,
Elliot, ... 16992
 Legal adviser permitted to man accused of
 violating, *Elliot*, ... 17836-49
 Liberty of teachers, *Elliot*, 16970-86, 17180-4
 Maternity rule, *Elliot*, 16946-58, 16973, 17072-8;
Mansfield, 21488-509; *Mahon*, 23469-82.
 no New rule should be retrospective in such a
 way as to injure existing teachers, *Mahon*,
 22964-85
 Notice should be given, and suggestion, *Elliot*,
 17069-17
 Notice should be given to teachers and should
 be laid on table of House of Commons before
 receiving sanction, *Mansfield*, 21429-2
 Nullified by Commissioners by private regulation,
Elliot, ... 17261-3
 Number, *Elliot*, ... 16992
 Number of changes, omissions, and number of
 new rules introduced harassing to teachers,
Elliot, ... 16992
 Retrospective, unlike any other branch of public
 or Government service, *Mahon*, ... 22797
 Rule 99 new, and old, *Mahon*,
 22566, 22569-60, 22562-71
 Rule 127(b), *Coaker*, 14744-52; *Elliot*, 16973,
 17079-86; *O'Callaghan*, 20610-29; *Mansfield*,
 21491-8, 21613-7; *MacSweeney*, 21681-90;
Mahon, 22715-21, 23261-94.
 Table of changes in new rules, and omitted rules,
Elliot, ... 16992
 Teachers should be treated according to, and not
 to official precedents, *Mahon*, 22996-23003
 Two sets, rules of code and rules of adminis-
 tration, *Mahon*, ... 22598
 should be no Unnecessary changes in wording,
Elliot, ... 17153-4

Board of National Education—continued.

SECRETARIES:	
should be an Office Committee, <i>Melroe</i> , 22738	
One, sometimes present at deputations, <i>Elliott</i> , 10382-3	
One at least should have practical experience as teacher or inspector, or preferably as both, <i>Mossfield</i> , 21074	
Surrender of balances misunderstood by many teachers, <i>Boyd</i> , 15098-01	
Teachers unfairly treated by, under new system, <i>Elliott</i> , 17062-7	
Very little sympathy with teachers, <i>Mossfield</i> , 21037-63	
Want of sympathetic administration, <i>Cross</i> , 18035	
Whole spirit of administration must be changed, <i>Mossfield</i> , 21036	
Boke, Mr., reports on Ballymacarrett Road School, Belfast, <i>Todd</i> , 18251	

BOYD, WILLIAM C., Principal Teacher, Ravenscroft School, Belfast: 15701-15906
method of marking roll said to be novel, 15901

BELFAST CIRCUIT:	
Description of Belfast as a shewn centre, question of, 15831-3	
Failure of teachers to appeal, question of, 15867-70	
47 per cent. of schools reduced, 15715-40, 15766-8, 15834	
Inspectors' observations, reply to, 15775-61	
No fall in efficiency corresponding to lowering of marks, 15833	
no Redress given to teachers in cases where mark was raised by re-inspection, 15940-3	
Relations between teachers and inspectors, deplorably bad, 15871	
Removal of inspector because of marking too soft, question, 15823-82	
Rules existing to have whole of schools investigated, question, 15945-7, 15934-9	
Statement by Mr. Dewar that there was no effective teaching in Belfast, 15969-72, 15709-72	

BOARD OF NATIONAL EDUCATION:	
Resident Commissioner, secret instructions from, considered cause of lowered marks in Belfast, 15725-32	
Surrender of balances misunderstood by many teachers, 15098-01	

INCREMENTS:	
Annual and automatic advocated, 15876-80	
Triennial, should be paid when due without any further trouble, 15833-7	

INSPECTORS:	
Appointments, exclusively from ranks of national teachers, advocated, 15884-90	
Examinations, advocated, 15849-52, 15873-83, 15894-906	
should not interfere with teachers' methods when working satisfactorily, 15907-27	

RAVENSCROFT SCHOOL, BELFAST:	
Manager works in concert with teacher for upkeep, 15750-69	
Observation Book, no commendation in, 15782	
Particular attention received from inspectors since Belfast Deputation, 15845-6, 15782	
Reduction of number on rolls ordered and particulars, 15793	
Tone, question, 15853-64	
Report and particulars, 15902-8	
School year, separate for each school, and examination in last month advocated, 15849-52, 15900-1	

TEACHERS:	
Conditions of service should be known, 15961-3	
should get notice of formal visits of inspectors, 15875, 15901	
Ownership of schools, question, 15761-5	
Statement that reports are received by, within one month of date of inspection, controverted, 15758-90	
Bradshaw, J. R., case of Board investigating anonymous charge against teacher, <i>Melroe</i> , 22520	

Browne, W. A.:

Helpful suggestions made, <i>Quinn</i> , 20372-3	
MARKING OF:	
Ballymore School, <i>Melroe</i> , 20736, 20738	
Callan School, <i>Mossfield</i> , 21136	
Glenties School, <i>Leahy</i> , 20600	
Kilmeave School, <i>O'Flanagan</i> , 19009	
Lisnawa Boys' School, <i>Cross</i> , 18285	
Mardyke School, <i>Swaney</i> , 10380-1, 15803	
Meibour School, <i>O'Heugan</i> , 18074, 19062-5, 19133-8	
Menard Boys' School, <i>O'Donoghue</i> , 19781	
Rathmore School, <i>Gair</i> , 16482, 19227	
Rathkevin School, <i>Quinn</i> , 20302, 20304	
Rosegreen School, <i>Keegan</i> , 20124	
Sherrinagh Girls' School, <i>Barry</i> , 20467	
Methods compared with other inspectors, <i>O'Flanagan</i> , 18739-42; <i>Cross</i> , 19205-8	
would not tolerate anything in nature of neglect of duty, <i>Mossfield</i> , 21706	

Burke, Miss Margaret:

Helpful suggestions made, <i>Quinn</i> , 20372-3	
Marking of Rathkevin School, <i>Quinn</i> , 20302-9, 20420-41	
Reference to, as "a" Miss Burke in connection with Dolphin's Barn disbursements, particulars and explanation, <i>MacDonagh</i> , 21991-22049	
Syme, Christine, dismissal, particulars, <i>MacDonagh</i> , 22196-9	

C.

CAHILL, THOMAS, Principal of Tycomnagh National School, Crossgar, County Down: 17600-17787	
Grade, 17601-1	
Personal career, 17694-5	
Campbell, P., delayed report, instance, <i>Melroe</i> , 22023	
Carycote School, dismissal of teacher, particulars, <i>MacDonagh</i> , 22170-95	
Carroll, Mrs., threatened with dismissal, <i>MacDonagh</i> , 22162	
CARTER, H. B., B.A., Principal of Omeara Road National School, Belfast: 17389-17399	
Personal career, 17390-4	
Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, inspectors, difference in mode of procedure from inspectors of National Board, 17386-17387	
APPEALS:	
Number would tend to be lessened rather than multiplied by extension of rights, 17588-99	
Question why teachers do not appeal when dissatisfied with result of inspection, 17468-17469	
Teachers should have powers of, for examination by higher official, 17588-17589	
Increments, annual automatic with higher initial salary and smaller increment, scheme, 17474-17479	
Inspection, present system not conducive to sound education, 17460, 17596-9	
INSPECTION:	
would not act as they have done if they had not high official sanction, 17462-17463	
no Complaints against individuals, 17462	
Conference with teachers suggested, 17495-17505	
Difference in method of procedure from those of Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, 17586-17587	
Examining in regular results style, against spirit of letter of Board, 17438-17443, 17448, 17440-17457	
Instructions sent out to, in 1902, approved, 17445-17449	
Rarely discuss matters of education with teachers, 17590	
should have had Teaching experience, not necessarily in National Schools, 17451-17484	
Training, more prolonged and effective, advocated, 17485-17494	

Carter, H. E.—continued.

MERIT MARKS:

- Abolition advocated, .. 17489
Personal, non-disclosure, and case of showing
how interests of teachers are affected, .. 17465-17472, 17569-17583

GIMELAU ROAD SCHOOLS, BELFAST:

- Effect of visits of inspection on extra subjects, .. 17466-17473, 17476-8
Expenses for cleaning and heating partly borne
by teachers, .. 17540-17550, 17576-9
Observation Book:
Complaint as to observations in, .. 17422-17425
Suggestions of vague character as to be practically
useless, .. 17426-17431
Size, .. 17397

SCHOOL PROGRAMME:

- Cookery and laundry work, methods adopted by
Committee to secure introduction, .. 17533-17539
English, teaching has not improved sufficiently, .. 17520-17524, 17591-5
Evils of results system practically re-introduced
under, .. 17591-17599
Modified, submission by teachers, question, .. 17525-17531
Subjects which might be left to higher elementary
schools or to technical schools, .. 17507-17520

TEACHERS:

- no Assiduation from inspectors in conversation, .. 17432-17435
Cleaning and heating schools by, cases, and
particulars, .. 17540-17579
Catholic Bishops, Protestant bishops not in same
position as, in regard to managers, Elliott, .. 16698-900
Chapelend Girls' School, lowering of report in recent
year, particulars, MacGowran, .. 22248-54, 22291-4

Chambers, J.:

- Marking by:
Ballydrain School, Grogg, .. 18433-42
Illustrations, Ramsey, .. 20944
Madrid Street School, Belfast, Jamieson, .. 17007
Nicholson Memorial School, Lichers, by, Smyth, .. 17767-9, 17871-81, 17789-91, 17791
Sydenham School, Belfast, particulars, Grogg, .. 18337-9, 18343-4, 18498-510
Tullycavey School, Anderson, .. 18150
Personal merit mark awarded by, particulars,
Jamieson, .. 17919
Report on Belfast about, Larnear, .. 18469
Report on St. James's School, Belfast, Larnear, .. 18703
Clarke, Mrs., dismissed, particulars, MacGowran, .. 22196-7

Clements, W. T.:

- Illustration of marking by, Ramsey, .. 20970-82
Reports on St. James' School, Belfast, Larnear, .. 18706

Clement Circuit:

- not Allowed to present appeal by deposition,
Mahon, .. 23487
Delay made by office, Mansfield, .. 21316
INSPECTORS:
Happy relations with teachers until advent of
Mr. Welby, Keegan, .. 20088
Removal to other circuits advocated, Mansfield,
21352-62; Mahon, 22928-40.
MERIT MARKS:
Board aware before dismissal of Mr. Mansfield
that Mr. Welby was marking more severely
than Mr. Brown, Dence, .. 23466-72
Complaints of general discontent as to mode of
inspection of Mr. Welby first heard at meeting
at Thurles, Mansfield, .. 21363-6
no Easy-going style of inspection prior to Mr.
Welby's transfer, Mansfield, .. 21799-1

Clement Circuit—continued.

Merit Marks—continued.

- Influence of Mr. Welby over junior inspectors,
and quotations from should not carry weight,
Mansfield, .. 21429
Information asked for refused by Board, Mans-
field, .. 21577
Re-inspection by Mr. Hynes, but teachers
refused any redress or recognition of wrong
done, Mansfield, .. 21797-8
Resident Commissioner must have been aware
of state of affairs in, even before memorial,
Mansfield, .. 21731-3
Restoration of, given under previous inspectors
and making good monetary loss only way of
redressing wrongs, Keegan, .. 20210-2
Severe marking of Mr. Welby, teachers entitled
to redress and question of, Garry, .. 19374-8
Steps taken to memorialise Board re marking of
Mr. Welby, particulars, Mansfield, .. 21765-7
Story of Mr. Welby of deposition to managers
groundless, Keegan, .. 20092
Mr. Welby's mark raised by Mr. Hynes in 4 out
of 6 schools, Keegan, .. 20207-8
Organisers' classes well attended by teachers,
Keegan, .. 20092-6

SCHOOLS:

- Opinion of Father Pembroke, Keegan, .. 20117, 20234-7
Re-inspection, but teachers refused any redress
or recognition of wrong done, Mansfield, .. 21797-9
Thirteen selected schools inspected by Mr. Hynes,
of which only 6 were in memorial, and question,
Keegan, 20092, 20205-6; Mansfield, 21441-4.
Mr. Welby's mark raised by Mr. Hynes in 4 out
of 6 schools, Keegan, .. 20207-8
see also particular names of schools.

TEACHERS:

- Children by Mr. Hynes for holding back com-
plaints so long and for acting in concert,
Keegan, .. 20089
Entitled to redress, and question of, Garry, .. 19374-8
Equal at least to those of any other circuit,
Mansfield, .. 21363-8
Happy relations between inspectors and, until
advent of Mr. Welby, Keegan, .. 20088
Letter to Board suggesting transfer of Mr. Welby
to vacancy in another circuit, Mansfield, .. 21352-62
Organisers' classes well attended, Keegan, .. 20092-6
Pecuniary obligations for equipment and upkeep
of schools, Keegan, .. 20213-26
Privileged letter to Board stating that in opinion
of Mr. Welby was qualifying for chief in-
spectorship, unfairness on part of Mr. Hynes,
and particulars, Mansfield, .. 21430-41
Restoration of merit marks given under previous
inspectors and making good of monetary loss
only way of redressing wrongs, Keegan, 20210-2
having serious grievances would not sign
memorial, Keegan, .. 20085-91, 20187-90
not a single teacher who signed memorial or who
sent in statements of complaint lined by Board,
and particulars, Mansfield, .. 21445-69
Statement that they were not prepared to give
Mr. Welby a fair trial refused, Mansfield, 21441
Statement that managers did not interfere in-
accurate, Mansfield, .. 21428

Cole, J. A.:

- Complaints of lowering reports all round ignored
by Board, Mansfield, .. 21316-9
MARKING OF:
Ballytowna School, Maher, .. 20736, 20738
Lowtown Boys' School by, Cross, .. 18373, 18570-83, 18587
Madrid Street School, Belfast, Jamieson, .. 17911, 17934-8, 17946, 17959
St. James's School, Belfast, Larnear, .. 18703
Personal merit mark awarded by, particulars,
Jamieson, .. 17922
Remarks in Observation Book of St. James' School,
Belfast, Larnear, .. 18702

- Gillies, Mr., dismissal, particulars, *MacSweeney*, 22160-75
- Composition, see Writing and Composition under School Programme.
- Connacht Managers, resolution passed by, calling for Dr. Sturges's removal, *Mahon*, 23352-60
- Consideration, Mr., case of Board investigating money charges against teacher, *Mahon*, 23521
- Corranagh School, instance as showing merit mark awarded at variance with general report, *Rossy*, 21910-3
- Convey School, case instance as showing merit mark awarded at variance with general report, *Rossy*, 21914-6
- Cookery, see under School Programme.
- Cookstown, Oldtown Boys' School :
 Case instance as showing school buildings influence merit marks, *Rossy*, 20978-82
 Merit marks, particulars, *Rossy*, 20988-9
 Principal teacher, income, *Rossy*, 20917-8
 Cornick, Miss Catherine, appeals particulars, *MacSweeney*, 22253-6
 Corporal punishment, circular and rules, *Elliff*, 18957-8, 17018-46, 17143-6
 Corporal punishment book, absurdity of, *Elliff*, 18967

COULTER, VERY REV. ISAAC, D.D., Dean of Kilmore and School Manager : 14625-14708

INSPECTORS :

- Examinations by, advocated, 14783-91, 15097-703, 14713-4, 14731-43, 14765-87, 14797-8
- Frequent changes, question of, 14655
- Junior, individuality cannot be got rid of by training, 14795-6
- One man contradicts another and changes timetable, 14652, 14788-91
- Tone and manner towards teachers, 14668-9, 14672, 14674-32, 14792-6
- Type of men as compared with those under Results system, 14690-4
- Managers, notice of inspectors' visits, shortness of, 14605-75, 14704
- Merit Marks, uniformity question, 14645-54, 14710-12, 14746, 14788-91
- Observation Book, inspector should not read former reports in, until he has written up his own, 14712
- Salaries, teachers should be properly remunerated so matter what average of school is, 14715-30
- School attendance, bad and intermittent and Compulsory Act not enforced, 14692-3, 14743-5, 14755-9

SCHOOLS :

- Conveyances for children, risk of accident, 14749-52, 14769-60
- Small, amalgamation encouraged by inspectors, said objection to, 14746-52
- School year, uniform or separate for each school, question, 14780-7, 14735-6, 14742

TEACHERS :

- Feeling that there is a great system of suspicion, 14673-5
- Grievances and discontent against individual inspector rather than system, 14635-42, 14753-4, 14761-4
- should be rewarded if school were particularly efficient and up to high standard, 14703-4
- Conrt School, reprimand and firing of teacher, particulars and mode of conducting investigation, *MacSweeney*, 22224

CROWE, REV. E. D., M.A., Rector of Carris, School Manager : 14710-14934

INSPECTORS :

- Examination advocated, 14829-33
- Junior, training, no suggestion to make, but should be properly trained, 14839-40
- Often placed in very invidious positions, 14847
- Tone and manner towards teachers, 14841-4, 14856-903

- Uniformity question, 14824-5, 14847-59
- Managers, shortness of notice of inspectors' visits, 14813-20, 14879, 14926-32

MERIT MARKS :

- Abolition advocated, 14851-3
- Local conditions and changed conditions of school should be taken into account, 14853A-7

Crowe, Rev. E. D.,—continued.

Merit Marks—continued.

- Test, circular, 14847-50, 14857-67
- Observation Book, inspectors should consult with teachers previous to writing in, 14844-5
- Primary Education, comparison of standard with that under Results system, 14914-6
- Reports, inspector should not read former until he has written up his own, 14903-13
- School Programme, should be more elasticity in view of possibilities in certain districts, 14870-6
- Schools, leaving certificate for fifth standard suggested, and for teachers to be partly awarded increment on, 14857-95, 14820-31

TEACHERS :

- no case known of provision of school equipment out of their own pockets, 14920-1
- should be incentive to improve qualifications for teaching in way of personal study apart from school, 14932-4
- Notice of inspectors' visits should be sent to, for formal inspection, 14880-6, 14923-6
- Furor and dissatisfaction, general, 14821-3, 14832-7

CROWE, EDMOND, Principal of Louth Boys' School, Galbally, County Louth : 18928-18992

Personal career,

- 18725-42

Cullen, Miss, dismissal, particulars, *MacSweeney*, 22080-91, 22108-75

Cullen School :

- Assistant teacher dismissed from position on ground that all grants to school were to be withdrawn if successor to Mr. Mansfield were not appointed by manager, *Mansfield*, 21829-38, 21899-941
- Merit marks, particulars, *Keegan*, 20208 ; *Mansfield*, 21131-308, 21330-40
- Referred to in memorial, *Keegan*, 20196
- Visit of Dr. Sturges, particulars, *Mansfield*, 21330-41

Cussen, Mr. :

- Marking of :
 Bessington Boys' School, *Leaden*, 21675
 Glensally School, *MacSweeney*, 22126

D.

Dale, F. H. :

- Rule 127(b) not drafted of until visit of, to Ireland in 1903, *Mansfield*, 21491, 21492-5
- Small schools reduced as result of visit, *Mansfield*, 21612

Dalton, J. P., reports on St. James's School, Belfast, *Lemire*, 18703

Dardis, C. P. :

- Criticism of time table of Louth Boys' School objected to, *Crowe*, 18603-75
- Marking of Louth Boys' School, Galbally, particulars, *Crowe*, 18557-63, 18606-35, 18605, 18609
- Particulars re visit to Louth Boys' School which gave rise to reprimand, *Crowe*, 18593
- Daridson, Mrs., case instance as showing merit mark awarded at variance with general report, *Rossy*, 21010-3

DEASE, MAJOR, Commissioner of National Education :

- Articles written by, statements in, questioned, 22417-23
- Ground on which Board rejected first proposal with regard to Mr. Mansfield, question, 22436-4
- Members of Board who first proposed Mr. Mansfield's dismissal and only member who voted for it on first occasion, and reasons, 22341-2, 22341
- Reference to Miss Mahon and teachers on letter sent to "Tablet," question, 22478-9
- Deputations, see under Board of National Education.
- Development grant, allocation of local grants, question of, *Mahon*, 23408-303
- Dough School, case instance as showing award of merit mark on scrappy inspection, *Rossy*, 20960

Dewar, Mr., Chief Inspector :

- Case of brother being manager and sister teacher of school, and particulars, *Elliot* 17326-35
 Examination of Tullycovey School, particulars, *Anderson* 18104-21
 Investigation into provision of desks at Ballymacarrett Road School, and reference to teacher, *Todd* 15109-13

MARKING OF :

- Ballymacarrett Road School, Belfast, *Todd* 14976-81, 15097-103, 15136-40
 Dendonald School, .. 14984-90
 Madrid Street School, Belfast, *Jamison* 17987, 17983-4, 17988-43, 17946-52, 17987-9, 18046-8
 Sydenham School, Belfast, *Grogg* 18351-3, 18358, 18447, 18452-6, 18474-8, 18476-80
 Tullycovey School, *Anderson* .. 18164
 Tyronnaught School, *Cobhill* 17653, 17640, 17651

- Observations made by, in Observation Book of Sydenham School, Belfast, *Grogg* 18375-8
 Personal merit mark awarded by, particulars, *Jamison* 17910-2
 Reference to remarks, *Boyd* 13787-90
 Reports on Belfast circuit, *Larne* 18603, 18626, 18630-3
 Stated that he had instructed Mr. Fenton to conduct away as long as he had him (Mr. Dewar) at his back, *Todd* 15352-8
 Statement that there was no effective teaching in Belfast, and question, *Todd* 15060-72, 15261-2, 15984-6; *Boyd* 15769-72.

Dickie, Mr. :

- Charge of rudeness against, appeal refused, *MacSwiney* 22234, 22236
 Inspection of Barranvilly School, particulars, *MacSwiney* 22028-115
 Insulting manner before children, *MacSwiney* 21978
 Interference with teacher's methods, case, *MacSwiney* 22287-8

MARKING OF :

- Angbrim School, *MacSwiney* 21976
 Blessington Boys' School, *Londes* 21077-113
 Glenelly School, *MacSwiney* 22136
 Mucklagh School, *MacSwiney* 22284
 Orders given to teacher as to method and effect, *MacSwiney* 22264-63
 Dillon, Mrs., threatened with dismissal, *MacSwiney* 22163

Dilworth, W. J., M.A. :

- Evidence referred to, *Jamison* 17923
 Statement that appointment of Mr. Ward gave teachers additional means of access to Board, reply to, *Mahan* 22547
 Visits to Loughness School, particulars, *Nash* 20291
 Mardryke School, *Sweeney* 19433, 19635-8
 Dyer, William, case mentioned as showing school buildings influence merit marks, *Rosney* 29683-90
 Dobarty, Mr., case of Board investigating anonymous charge against teacher, *Mahan* 22513-20

Dolphin's Barn Girls' School, Dublin :

- Dismissal of principal and assistant teachers, particulars and procedure of investigation, *MacSwiney* 21601-22045, 22163, 22165
 Dismissal of teachers, question as to whether rule was carried out, *Deane* 22404-16
 Domestic Science, see *Cookery, Laundrywork and Domestic science under School Programme*.
 Donovan, Mrs. Sarah J., lowering of report in increment year, particulars, *MacSwiney* 22243-54, 22381-4

- Dwan, Rev. J. C. Emmerton, connection with case of Mr. Stewart, *Elliot* 17267-323

Downing, Edmund :

- Evidence referred to, *Manfield* 21543-7

MARKING OF :

- Mardryke School, *Sweeney* 19616-24, 19651, 19653, 19747
 Mohober School, *O'Mahony* 18974-7, 19054-61, 19065

- Doyle, Michael, case of appeal being refused, *MacSwiney* 22328-39
 Drawing, see *under School Programme*.
 Dundonald School, merit marks, particulars, *Todd* 14981-91

Dunlop, Mr. :

- Helpful suggestions made, *Quinn* 20372
 Marking of Rathkeeran School, *Quinn* 20368-71

E.

- Eac, Mrs. Jane, dismissal, particulars, *MacSwiney* 22146-65

- Educational Reform Association in Belfast, pamphlet published by, and reprint of Mr. Elliott for connection with, particulars, *Elliot* 17341-6, 17348-63

- ELLIOTT, DANIEL, B.A., Treasurer of Irish National Teachers' Organisation, as Capacity as representing Teachers' Organisation Maynooth resolutions regarded as sham settlement, and question, *Manfield* 21902-19, Evidence, 16324-17389
 Personal history, 16334-43
 Relations with Mr. McEldowne, particulars, 17343
 Reprimand, particulars, 17341-6, 17348-63

APPEALS :

- Made before and after new system, and new rules limit teachers, 17210-21
 Procedure by Irish National Teachers' Organisation, 16923-5
 Rule nullified by Commissioners by private regulation, 17261-3

BOARD OF NATIONAL EDUCATION :

- Circulars :
 Conference should be held before issuing, 17047
 Rules made by independently of rules set forth in code, 17200-1
 "Tone," unfavourable to teachers, 16992
 Objection to, as at present constituted, 17228-9
 Rules and Regulations :
 Check on, an ineffectual safeguard, 16967
 Constant changes, 17156-68
 Deceased to show that Board has not any great capacity or competence in the making of, 18096-17603
 Fundamental, should not be changed without sanction of Lord Lieutenant, 17138-41
 Latest edition, hypercritical nature of changes, 16992
 Legal adviser permitted to man who is accused of violating, 17336-40
 Notice should be given, and suggestions, 17008-17
 Number, 16992
 Number of changes, omissions, and number of new rules introduced harassing to teachers, 16992
 Table of changes in new rules, and omitted rules, 16992
 should be no Unnecessary changes in wording, 17133-4

- Corporal punishment, circular and rules, 16937-8, 17613-46, 17142-3
 Corporal punishment book, absurdity of, 16967

GRADERS :

- Comparison with old system, 17170-211
 One of most retrograde and unsatisfactory rules of new system, 16973
 Teachers should have been allowed option of remaining under old rule or coming under new, 17056-61
 Teachers opposed to change from class salary to, 17248-50
 Time taken to reach maximum, 16973

INCREMENTS :

- Automatic and annual in absence of adverse report advocated, 17253, 17249-3
 Forty-six out of sixty schools having lost money from lowering of reports, 17894-6

INSPECTORS :

- Districts changed too frequently, 17136-7
 Junior, sanction of master necessary for raising or lowering reports, 16992
 Time spent in schools too short to judge of merit mark, and do not know local circumstances, 17230-2

Elliott, Daniel—continued.

IRISH NATIONAL TEACHERS' ORGANISATION:	
Appeals to Board in defence of teacher's rights in relation to Board, procedure, ..	16942-5
Belfast Association a branch, ..	16944-59
Burden thrown upon teachers for cleaning and upkeep of schools part of work of organisation, ..	16938-9
Cases of hardship exposed, and number, ..	16874-9
Central Executive Committee:	
Deputation respecting maternity rule received nominally by whole Board, ..	16946-51
a Permanent standing committee, and number of meetings held annually, ..	16932-4
Changes in rules as result of, ..	16886-93
Chairman, change annually, ..	16882
Complaints always came from teachers, ..	16884
Deputations:	
on General question and only in one instance or so with particular case, ..	16885-5
Received by Dr. Stankie, ..	16874-8, 16887, 16889
not received by any other members of Board than Dr. Stankie, ..	16881
Refusal of Dr. Stankie to receive certain members of organisation, and reasons, ..	16960-5
Funds:	
Benevolent, purely voluntary, and subscription, ..	16939-41
Central:	
and Object, ..	16932
Subscription, ..	16933
Defiance:	
Date of establishment, and object, ..	16932-3
Subscription, ..	16933
Length of existence, ..	16933
Meetings, number held annually, ..	16887-8, 16889
Protestant managers only, dealt with, ..	16890-1
Secretary, ..	16883
Total membership, ..	16862-4
Treasurer, amount of business considerable, ..	16880-81
MANAGERS:	
Confidential report, abolished in 1911, and particulars, ..	16988-92, 17120-2
Obligations for obtaining grant for heating and cleaning schools not always carried out, ..	16919-23
Presbyterian scheme to establish some form of arbitration, but not accepted, ..	16991-2
Protestant bishops not in same position as Catholic bishops in regard to, ..	16896-906
MISCELLANEOUS:	
Abolition advocated as altogether unworkable and unfair, ..	17230-2, 17233-9, 17251-4
Forty-six out of ninety schools having lost money through lowering of, ..	17364-6
MONTESSORI:	
Outlines lessons established by circular, ..	16973, 17068-71
Some teachers do without, as trouble considered too great for any advantage received from services, ..	16973
Teachers required to devote extra time to instruction, for which they receive no pecuniary reward, ..	16973
Promotion, barriers to, ..	16973
Reports, entirely, and abolition of merit mark advocated, ..	17233-9
Salaries, comparison of grading with old system, ..	17180-211
Scholarships from national and intermediate schools, conference respecting, ..	16939
School attendance, marking of pupils, particulars, ..	16967, 17195-19
SCHOOL PROGRAMME:	
Fee for teaching extra subjects, except Irish abolished in 1905, ..	16973, 17087-95
Mathematics, fees abolished, but afterwards restored, ..	16973-6
Reading, books, new rule, ..	16982, 17124-5
SCHOOLS:	
Cleaning, usually done by teachers in Belfast schools, in country schools by children themselves under teacher's eye, ..	16917-3

Elliott, Daniel—continued.

Grant for heating and cleaning:	
Conditions, ..	16920
Obligations carried out by parochial authorities in some cases but not in others, ..	16918-23
Part of money directed to be applied to outside of house, ..	17123
Small boys, rule that only women must teach, and effect, ..	16973, 17079-86
Vacations, rules and effect, ..	16974, 17036-9
SCHOOL YEAR:	
Forms for, issued by Inspectors, particulars, ..	17149-87
Individual for each school advocated, and reasons, ..	17048-53, 17257-9
Three additional as well as uniform, ..	16973-3
Uniform:	
Established by circular, ..	16972
Objections to, ..	16972
Rule cause of trouble to teachers, ..	16972
TEACHERS:	
may be Appointed additional Councilors, ..	16981
Atmosphere of intense dissatisfaction all over country, and particularly in North, and cases, ..	17076-89
to Avoid fairs, markets, and meetings, to abstain from controversy, and to do nothing in or out of school which might have tendency to confine it to any denomination of children, ..	16973, 16981
Catholics, Mayo's resolutions accepted as sufficient guarantee, ..	16981
Cleaning and upkeep of schools:	
Ballymacarrett case, ..	16911-4
Case of Mr. Mervyn, ..	16960-10
Investigation part of work of Irish National Teachers' Association, ..	16904-9
Dismissals:	
without Appeal, grievance removed by Irish National Teachers' Association, ..	16886-95
Case of Mr. Stewart, and mode of trial, particulars, ..	17267-325
Change in rules does not give complete defence, and reason, and case, ..	16953-7
for Inefficiency, increase under new system, ..	17218-4
Forbidden to keep public houses or houses for sale of spirituous liquors, or to live in any such house, ..	16973-81
Husband at wife of owner or occupier of public-house not recognised as, ..	16983-4
Legal adviser permitted, ..	17336-40
Liberty of rules, ..	16974-86, 17109-116
Maternity rule:	
Copy of report on deputation to be forwarded, ..	16957-5
Deputation from Irish National Teachers' Association received nominally by whole Board, ..	16944-51
Vested rights swept away, and teachers heavily penalised, ..	16973, 17073-4
Virtually withdrawn in case of existing teachers, ..	16974
New clause in regulations since Local Government Act came into operation, ..	16981
Notes of lessons, had forced on teachers, and in most cases injurious rather than helpful, ..	16992, 17195-33
Permitted to act as presiding officers and polling clerks at elections, ..	16981
not Permitted to carry on, or engage in, any business or occupation that will impair their usefulness as teachers, ..	16976
have to Print on blackboard lessons for infants, ..	17067-9
Prohibited from contacting any constituency, ..	16941-5
Rule that only women must teach small boys and effect, ..	16973, 17079-86
where Schools have declined in usefulness and efficiency, or who have conducted themselves improperly, old and new rules, ..	17228-9
Status entirely changed by new system without any previous notice being given, ..	16973
Unfairly treated by Board under new system, ..	17062-7

England :

- L.C.C., procedure with regard to charges against teachers, *Maken*, ... 22587
 Teachers, freedom in civil rights, *Monagfield*, ... 21862-3
 English, see under School Programme.

F.

Fenton, J. :

- Mr. Dewar stated that he had instructed, to reduce away as long as he had him (Mr. Dewar) at his back, *Todd*, ... 15232-3
 Marking of Madrid Street School, Belfast, *Jameson*, ... 17697, 17925-23, 17961
 Marking of St. James's School, Belfast, *Larnear*, ... 14660
 Personal merit mark awarded by, particulars, *Jameson*, ... 17919
 Remarks in Observation Book of St. James's School, Belfast, *Larnear*, ... 18703
 Report on St. James's School, Belfast, *Larnear*, ... 14703
 Forsyth, Mr., Delayed report, instance, *Maken*, ... 23523
 Fraw, Thomas, Dismissal, particulars, *MacSwiney*, ... 22965-29; *Maken*, 22568-71.

Fitzgerald :

- D P., marking and report of St. Kevin's Girls' School, *Derry*, ... 20475-3, 20509
 Patrick J. :
 Manner, *Berry*, ... 20621-2, 20665
 Marking of :
 Cullen School, *Monagfield*, ... 21189-95
 Belfast School, *Maken*, ... 20748
 Glenhaine School, *Leahy*, ... 20609
 Lonsdown Boys' School, *Cress*, ... 18601
 Minihyke School, *Swanney*, 19615-8, 19632, 19688, 19655-7, 19664, 19663-7, 19648-6
 Mohober School, *O'Mahony*, 19974, 19923-4, 19971, 19982-3, 19158-4
 Monard Boys' School, *O'Donnell*, 19788, 19792, 19786-8, 19848
 Rathgorman School, *Gair*, 19488, 19473-85, 19482
 Rosegrove School, *Kearney*, 20887, 20151
 St. Kevin's School, *Berry*, 20471, 20586, 20573-5
 Templemore School, *O'Grady*, ... 19949
 Observations in Mohober School; observation book contradicting Mr. Welpy's statement, *O'Mahony*, ... 19938-42

Fitzpatrick :

- Mr. May, case illustrating interference with teacher's methods, *MacSwiney*, ... 22397-8
 Mr., marking of :
 Glenhaine School, *Leahy*, ... 20609
 Kilmalee School, *O'Gorman*, 18768-74, 18837-42, 18887-9, 18886
 Lonsdown Boys' School, *Cress*, ... 18600
 Minihyke School, *Swanney*, 19604-14, 19625, 19660, 19741-6
 Mohober School, *O'Mahony*, 18974, 19151
 Moycarkey School, *Maher*, 20761-6, 20765-7
 Rathgorman School, *Gair*, ... 19488
 Rosegrove School, *Kearney*, 20134, 20187, 20138-9
 St. Kevin's Schools, *Berry*, 20467, 20470, 20673

- FOGARTY, P. J., Principal of Gortnagowna School :
 Career, ... 18311-35
 has not suffered financially by lowering of mark as got promotion dated back, *Fegarty*, ... 18392-404

Franklin, Mr. :

- Marking of :
 Sydenham School, Belfast, *Grogan*, ... 18359-63, 18432, 18476-7
 Templemore School, *O'Grady*, 18887-8, 18950

G.

- Gaelic League, joint deputations with Irish National Teachers' Organisation to Education Office, particulars, *Maken*, ... 23373-4
 Galbally School, see *Lonsdown School*, Galbally.
 Geography, see under School Programme.
 Gough, P., dismissed on investigation by chief inspector, particulars, *MacSwiney*, ... 22221-2

Glenhaine School :

- Lowering of report on account of work of junior assistant mistress, *Leahy*, ... 20696, 20698-15, 20656-3
 Merit marks, particulars, *Leahy*, ... 20696-97
 Principal Teacher :
 Improper fixing of salary and increments, *Leahy*, ... 20696, 20655-7, 20615-49
 Loss of special promotion on account of lowering of marks, *Leahy*, ... 20696
 Losses through abolition of classification, *Leahy*, ... 20696

Glenhaine School :

- Dismissal of teacher, particulars, *MacSwiney*, ... 22130-44

Glester, Mr. :

- Case of charging teacher with discourtesy, and sentence of teacher by Board and manner of investigation of matter, *Ramsay*, ... 21024-9
 Illustration of marking by, *Ramsay*, ... 21022
 Gurnley, Mr., case of, *Elliot*, ... 17383

Gortnagowna School :

- Applicants for re-examination refused, and particulars, *Fegarty*, ... 19333-9, 19368, 19410-25, 19448-52
 Merit marks, particulars, *Fegarty*, ... 19336-452
 Referred to, in memorial, *Kearney*, ... 20194
 in Very bad state in 1950, *Fegarty*, ... 19486-7

Grades :

- First, First of Teachers entitled to promotion cannot get, *Monagfield*, ... 21675
 second, slow promotion of assistant teachers to, *Monagfield*, ... 21552-5
 Third, increment claimed for untrained teachers to at least top of, *Maken*, ... 23065-76
 should be abolished, *Ramsay*, 21058, 21662-5 ; *Maken*, 22908
 Average necessary for promotion to higher, should be abolished, *Monagfield*, ... 21675-8
 Comparison with old system, *Elliot*, 17179-211
 Condemned by Dr. Trail, *Maken*, ... 23323
 Effect of system on rural schools, *Maken*, 22715-21
 Grading of assistant teachers, *Maken*, 23018-32
 One of most retrograde and unsatisfactory rules of new system, *Elliot*, ... 18973
 Standard numbers should be abolished, *Monagfield*, 21675 ; *Maken*, 23034-40
 Teachers opposed to change from class salary to, *Elliot*, ... 17248-50
 Teachers should have been allowed option of remaining under old rule or coming under new, *Elliot*, ... 17964-61
 Time taken to reach maximum, *Elliot*, ... 16973
 Undergraded teachers, number and injustice, *Swanney*, 17943-18038 ; *Maken*, 22707-14, 23032-5, 23160-215
 Vested interests of teachers ignored, *Fask*, 20250
 see also Increment and Promotion.

Greer, Rev. Usher :

- Dismissals of teachers by, particulars, *McCluggage*, ... 16439-40
 Letter re visit of Messrs. Keith and Kelly
 Lonsdown school referred to, but not present in school on any visit of Mr. Kelly, *McCluggage*, ... 16375-82
 Refusal to allow sentence to be taught in Lonsdown School, *McCluggage*, ... 16516-25

- GREGG, JOHN A., Principal of Sydenham National School, Belfast :
 Career, ... 18317-18327
 Personal career, ... 18317-35

- GURRY, EDMOND, Principal of Rathgorman School, ... 19453-19476
 Career, ... 19453-45
 no pecuniary loss in consequence of lowered mark
 19450-2

H.

- Harrison, Miss, lowering of report following visit of Dr. Starkie, *MacSwiney*, 22144-53
 Hart, Mr., dismissal, particulars, *MacSwiney*, 22156-75
 Headen, W. P., reports on St. James's School, Belfast, *Larne*, 10708
 Heenan, Mr., case of, *Elliot*, 17389
 Hennessy, Miss, case of vested rights of teachers being ignored in making rules, *Nash*, 20341-51
 Hewitt, Mr., case of, *Elliot*, 17383
 Hillen School, see under *Larne*
 Hogarty, Mr., case of teacher being entitled to promotion but not obtaining, *Nash*, 20348-10
 Home lessons, see under *School Programme*.

Homan, P. J. :

- Appeal against marking of school by, particulars, *Anderson*, 18190-21
 Charge against Mr. Todd of altering Observation Book, *Todd*, 15655-89
 Inaccuracy in marking a subject not taught, *Todd*, 15681-6
 Mark of Ladley School lowered on account of premises, *Todd*, 15690-1

MARKING OF :

- Aughrim School, *MacSwiney*, 21374
 Ballymacarrett Road School, *Todd*, 15352-3, 15371, 15514-7
 Nalohan Memorial School, *Larne*, *Swagh*, 17725-6, 17752-41, 17779-1, 17779-41,
Sydenham School, Belfast, *Grogan*, 18389-7, 18493
 Tukeyway School, particulars, *Anderson*, 18075, 18085, 18153-55, 18230-40, 18273-93
 Reply to observations handed in *Todd*, 18440-53
 Statement by, that inspectors had reduced marks in schools in Belfast and the managers would be compelled to build new schools or improve existing ones, *Todd*, 15589, 15576
 Statements should have been put in Observation Book, *Todd*, 15431-41, 15555-65

Houston, James :

- Case instanced as showing merit mark awarded at variance with general report, *Remsey* 21014-5
 Case of increment being lost because of dropping of examination for one year, *Remsey*, 20932-44
 Hull, Mr., case brought forward to show school worry had caused death, and not burning action of inspector, *McGaughey*, 18501-5

Hynes, James Joseph, Chief Inspector :

- Connection with case of Mr. Stewart, *Elliot*, 17267-325
 Connection with reprimand of Mr. Elliott, *Elliot*, 17361-6
 Considered responsible for lowering marks by teachers, *Todd*, 15239, 15241
 Criticism of teachers in Glenside circuit for holding back complaints so long and for acting in concert, *Keegan*, 20087
 Marking of :

- Bloxington Boys' School, *Londonderry*, 21071-3
 Cullen School, *Manfield*, 21190-3, 21342
 Longmarch School, *Nash*, 20239-41, 20245, 20271-301
 Mardyske School, *Swiney*, 18639-49
 Mark of Mr. Welpy raised in 4 out of 6 schools, *Keegan*, 20207-3 ; *Manfield*, 21444
 not Personally considered cause of lowering marks in Belfast District, *Todd*, 15021-8
 Sherrardagh Girls' School, *Berry*, 20498-507, 20512-15
 Suspected to be origin of raising standards in Belfast circuit, *Boyd*, 18729, 18730
 Re-inspection of Glenside circuit by, *Manfield*, 21791-2
 Statement that inspectors were cause of failure of results system denied by, *Boyd*, 18794-8
 Statement that Tipperary teachers were not prepared to give Mr. Welpy a fair trial, *Manfield*, 21441

Hynes, James Joseph—continued.

Marking of—continued.

- Thirteen selected schools in Glenside circuit inspected by, of which only 6 were in unusual, and question, *Keegan*, 20082, 20205-6
 Uniforms on part of, re privileged letter to Board stating that in opinion of Glenside teachers Mr. Welpy was qualifying for Chief Inspectorship, and particulars, *Manfield*, 21430-41
 Visit to Mohobor School, particulars, *O'Mahony*, 18015-29, 18040

I.

INCREMENTS :

- should be Annual and Automatic in absence of any serious report, *Todd*, 15386-7, 15637, 15688-90 ; *Boyd*, 15678-80 ; *Robertson*, 18008-109 ; *McGaughey*, 18025 ; *Elliot*, 17335, 17340-5 ; *Carver*, 17474-9 ; *Swagh*, 17704-7, 17848-52 ; *O'Gorman*, 18047-8 ; *Owen*, 18216, 18217-30, 18274-80 ; *Nash*, 20260 ; *Remsey*, 21038-41, 21058 ; *Manfield*, 21675, 21676, 21920-42, 21058 ; *MacSwiney*, 23311-6 ; *Mohor*, 23672-6, 23693, 23853-966

- Case of teacher now in Canada always losing, by reason of reduction of merit mark in third year, *Remsey*, 20923-5
 Cases of teachers being done out of a year's, owing to no examination being held for one year, *Remsey*, 20931-54
 Depending on inspectors' reports injurious to educational efficiency of country, *Swagh*, 17848
 should not depend on merit marks, *Remsey*, 21033
 Delays, *Mohor*, 23679-85
 Delays in awarding, and pressure necessary to secure, *Manfield*, 21676
 Delayed when deserved in ordinary way, *Manfield*, 21697-11

- Fade of inspectors cultivated by teachers in order to get, at expense of sound education, *Owen*, 18243-7

- 66 out of 30 schools having lost money from lowering of reports, *Elliot*, 17384-6
 Increase has not kept pace with cost of living, *Manfield*, 21675, 21034-6
 to at least top of third grade claimed for untrained teachers, *Mohor*, 23669-70
 Lowering of reports in increment year, cases and particulars, *MacSwiney*, 22233-83
 Necessity for appeals would be largely done away with if, did not depend on reports, *Anderson*, 18366

- should be Paid when due without any further trouble, *Boyd*, 18003-7
 Partial, *Manfield*, 21335-7 ; *Mohor*, 23689-93
 Partial award on leaving certificate for fifth standard suggested, *Owen*, 18229-31
 should be more rigid in beginning and should then slack off, *MacSwiney*, 22294-311
 Rules not known to teachers, *Mohor*, 23698-425
 Teachers threatened with denial of, unless they introduced cookery, *Mohor*, 23677-83
 Withdrawal of, of assistant at Lowntown Boys' School through adverse report on third year of incremental period, *Owen*, 18271-92, 18676-85

Inspection System :

- Cost of, *Manfield*, 21464-71
 Present system not conducive to sound education, *Carver*, 17880, 17896-9
 System just neither to teacher, child, nor inspector, *Mohor*, 23727-80

Inspectors :

- not Able to appreciate spirit of new system, *Cahill*, 17698, 17701
 would not Act as they have done if they had not high official sanction, *Carver*, 17402-3
 Administration responsible for insupportable grievance of teachers, *Mohor*, 23611-34
 Amalgamation of small schools encouraged by, and objection to, *Coalter*, 14746-52

ANNUAL OR GENERAL INSPECTION :

- Carrying on Examinations, beyond school hours, practice common, *Remsey*, 20946-9

Inspectors—continued.

Arrival of General Inspection—continued.

Cases of teachers being done out of a year's movement owing to no examination being held for one year, *Remsey*, .. 20631-54
 Children in irregular attendance or backward might be excluded, *Smith*, 17803-3, 17837-40; *Mansfield*, 21653, *Mahan*, 22640
 should be Class examination; but in essential subjects each child should get questions, *Mahan*, .. 22633-4
 Combination of examination and inspection advocated, *Croce*, 18635; *Mansfield*, 21657, 21658; *Mahan*, 22632-45, 22652-5
 Examination advocated, *Coulter*, 14663-61, 14697-103, 14713-4, 14731-42, 14765-67, 14797-8; *Croce*, 14829, 14838; *Todd*, 15143-5, 15212-22, 15218-38, 15413-26, 15609-9, 15687; *Boyd*, 16840-52, 16872-83, 16894-906; *Gregg*, 16214-5; *Owens*, 19202-8, 19300-3, 19390-10
 Examination undesirable, and reason, *McDonough* 16427; *Remsey*, 21653
 should be Fixed day, *Mahan*, 22637-30, 22640-52
 in Last month of school year advocated, *MacSwiney*, 22322-4; *Mahan*, .. 22632
 Managers should be given opportunity of being present, *O'Flanagan*, 20023-5, 20069-7
 Minimum number of attendances should be required from children before admittance, *Mahan* .. 22630-3
 Examining as regular results style, against spirit of letter of Board, *Carter*, 17428-42, 17448, 17449-57
 Notice of visits to managers, shortness of, and suggestion, *Coulter*, 14663-75, 14764; *Owens*, 14813-29, 14879, 14928-32
 Percentages of passes taken, *Gregg*, .. 18511-9
 Portion of examination might be done by teacher, *Anderson*, 18248-50; *Mansfield*, 21656; *Mahan*, 22634
 Real examination and inspection and not perfunctory examination advocated, *Smith*, 17803-7, 17802, 17828-30
 System, half examination and half inspection, and objected to, and examination should be thorough if held, *Anderson*, .. 18245-53
 Teachers should get notice, *Owens*, 14488-9
 14923-5; *Todd*, 15214-22, 15419, 15687; *Boyd*, 15875, 15991; *Croce*, 18641; *O'Flanagan*, 20020-3, 20064-5; *Remsey*, 21642-57; *Mansfield*, 21656, 21658; *MacSwiney*, 22317-9; *Mahan*, 22629-30
 a Year or thereabouts should be allowed, *Mansfield*, .. 21656

APPOINTMENTS:

Competitive examination advocated, and teaching experience necessary, *Todd*, 15182-207; *Keegan*, 20607-103, 20615; *Mansfield*, 21640
 Exclusively from ranks of National Teachers advocated, *Boyd*, .. 15884-90
 should be some Outsiders and not all National teachers, *Mansfield*, .. 21767-70
 should have had teaching experience, not necessarily in National Schools, *Carter*, 17481-4
 Practical experience in teaching, and teaching or training diploma required, *Nash*, 20022-5; *Mansfield*, 21659, 21641-4; *Mahan*, 22603-6
 Service marks should count, *Mansfield*, 21641
 no Assistance to teachers in conversation, *Carter*, .. 17432-6

BELFAST:

Removal to other critics advocated, *Mahan*, 22628-40
 Re-inspection looked upon as a farce by teachers, *Todd*, .. 15355-59
 Removal because of marking too soft, question, *Boyd*, .. 15928-32
 Relations to teachers deplorably bad, *Boyd*, 15871
 Case of obnoxious teacher with discourtesy, and course of teacher by Board, and manner of investigation of matter, *Remsey*, .. 21624-9
 frequent Charges, question of, *Coulter*, 14655; *Todd*, 15445-52; *Smith*, 17185-7; *Anderson*, 18193-7, 18224-6; *Croce*, 18594-6

Inspectors—continued.

CRUI:

Dismissal of teachers on investigation by, particulars, *MacSwiney*, .. 22506-22
 Evidence in disproof of statement that adverse circumstances are duly considered and rather favour teachers, *Mansfield*, .. 21734-6
 Implication that disqualification is confined to one or two circuits or agitators contradicted, *Mansfield*, .. 21721-33
 Investigation into case of dismissal of principal and assistant teachers from Delphin's Bare Girls' School, particulars, *MacSwiney* .. 21981-22049
 should be on Office Committee, *Mahan*, .. 22788
 no Power to criticise policy of Board, *Mansfield*, 21653-7
 Re-inspection of schools in case of breakdown should not be carried out by, as being indicated in case, *Todd*, .. 15256-60
 CIRCUITS:
 Bad arrangement for education of country to have senior and circuit inspectors working in same, and no one really responsible for any portion of work, *Smith*, .. 17862-4
 Division of work into, opinion as to arrangement, *Robertson*, .. 18384-6
 Circulars to, not sufficiently definite, and more or less impossible of interpretation, and contradictory, *Mahan*, .. 22511-6
 Comparison of old style with new, *Mahan*, 22517-34
 no Complaints against individuals, *Carter*, .. 17403
 Conferences with Board should be held, *Mahan*, .. 22332

CONFERENCES WITH TEACHERS:

Advocated, *Carter*, 17495-505; *Smith*, 17700-801; *Anderson*, 18197, 18267-8; *Mahan*, 22321-2
 Conferences with Teachers:
 Suggested mode, *Anderson*, .. 18211-19
 would be Valueless under present system, *Anderson*, .. 18207-10
 should Consult with teachers previous to writing in Observation Book, *Croce*, .. 14844-5
 Difference in mode of procedure from those of Agriculture and Technical Instruction Board, *Carter*, 17586-7; *Smith*, 17825-7; *Owens*, 19256-7, 19260-4; *Mansfield*, 21683-5
 Fads cultivated by teachers in order to get increment at expense of sound education, *Owens*, .. 19246-7
 Fairness and justice, question of, *O'Callaghan*, 20657-69

HEAD:

Preferred to senior inspectors, *Owens*, 19230-9
 Reversion to system desired, *Mansfield*, 21603-5
 Incidental visits would show inspector working of school, *Mahan*, .. 22632
 Inclined to exasperate teachers and managers, should not be promoted to higher ranks, *Mansfield*, .. 21644
 Insolence alleged by teachers, appeals refused, *MacSwiney*, .. 22230-2
 Instructions sent out to, in 1902 approved, *Carter*, 17442-9
 should not interfere with teachers' methods when working satisfactorily, *Boyd*, .. 15919-27
 Investigation of appeals in cases of dismissal by some authority independent of, desired, *MacSwiney*, .. 22049-78
 Junior

JONES:

or Experience in teaching necessary, *Keegan*, 20104-14
 Sanction of senior necessary for raising or lowering reports, *Ediot*, .. 16992
 new Power put in hands of unscrupulous by, *Boyd*, .. 16992
 Individuality cannot be got rid of by, *Coulter*, 14703-9
 more Prolonged and effective, advocated, *Carter*, .. 17485-94
 no Suggestion to make, but should be properly trained, *Croce*, .. 14839-40
 main use of Observation Book for succeeding, *Todd*, .. 15432

Inspectors—continued.

Junior—continued.

- One man contradicts another and changes timetable, *Cosker*, .. 14682, 14788-91
 should be Placed in charge of district and made responsible for certain number of years, *Makos*, .. 22823-31
 often Replaced in very invidious position, *Croce*, .. 14847
 not Properly trained for work, *Todd*, .. 15087
 Questions should not be asked beyond work recorded in Progress Book, *Anderson*, .. 18189
 should not Read former reports until they have written up their own, *Cosker*, 14712; *Croce*, 14963-13; *Todd*, 14532.
 should not Recommend change of organisation in school without giving practical illustration of how to carry it out, *Makos*, .. 23043-51
 should Remain considerable number of years in same circuit, *Seyth*, .. 17766-9
 Scotland, see under Scotland.
 Scrappy inspection, illustration of award of merit mark, on, *Kewsey*, .. 20985, 21007-9

Senior:

- Old system of Head Inspectors preferred to, *Croce*, .. 19239-9
 Sanction necessary before junior raise or lower reports, *Elliot*, .. 16992
 should Show desire to sympathise and co-operate with teachers, *Mansfield*, .. 21644
 Suggestions in some cases found useful, but in some very foolish, *Reyd*, .. 15007-18

SUGGESTED VISITS:

- should not be Outside hours mentioned in timetable, *Mansfield*, .. 21654
 Possible injustice, *Makos*, .. 22823
 Teachers criticised by, for want of preparation for lessons, *Todd*, .. 15223-7
 Teachers should be permitted to see all "Instructions to Inspectors," *Kewsey*, .. 21068
 would tend to prevent misunderstanding if no entry were made in Observation Book without inspector having talk with teacher on proposed observation, *Anderson*, .. 18261-6
 Time spent in schools too short to judge of merit mark, and do not know local circumstances, *Elliot*, .. 17230-3
 Time taken by, to decide marks, question of, *Mansfield*, .. 21737-9
 Tone and manner towards teachers, *Cosker*, 14656-9, 14672, 14676-82, 14792-6; *Rev. E. D. Croce*, 14841-3, 14895-903; *Todd*, 16037-56, 15113-3, 15173-81; *Larmour*, 16792-3; *Cosker*, 17432-3, 17506; *Gregg*, 18379-82; *E. Croce*, 18682-4; *Croce*, 19298-9; *Gair*, 19519-25; *O'Callaghan*, 20862-73; *Kewsey*, 21013-23; *Mansfield*, 21644
 Type of men as compared with those under *Beattie* system, question, *Cosker*, .. 14660-4
 Uniformity question, *Cosker*, 14443-54, 14750-12, 14746, 14788-91; *Croce*, 14824-8, 14847-49; *Todd*, 15212; *Gregg*, 18382; 18415-9
 should be no undue interference with school organisation, *Seyth*, .. 17869
 see also particular names.

Intermediate schools, see under Schools.

Irish, see under School Programmes

Irish National Teachers' Association:

- Appeal to King re extra week's Coronation vacation, to get answer from Board, *Makos*, .. 23497
 Appeals to Board in defence of teachers' rights in relation to Board, procedure, *Elliot*, 16942-5
 Attitude of Dr. Starke towards, *Makos*, 23496-7
 Belfast Association a branch, *Elliot*, 16864-50
 Bardon throws upon teachers for cleaning and upkeep of schools part of work of organisation, *Elliot*, .. 16903-9
 Cases of hardship exposed, and number, *Elliot*, 16974-0

CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

- Decision to send no deputation to Dr. Starke while he banned any member of, *Makos*, .. 23494-6, 23574
 Resolution re increase in disbursements passed, *MacSweeney*, .. 22049

Irish National Teachers' Association—continued.

Central Executive Committee—continued.

- a Permanent standing committee and number of meetings held annually, *Elliot*, 16939-1
 Chairman, change annually, *Elliot*, .. 16862
 Changes in rules as result of, *Elliot*, .. 16860-65
 Complaints always come from teachers, *Elliot*, 16884
 Concessions to teachers was without any practical hold from Board, *Makos*, .. 23089-128

DEPUTATIONS TO BOARD:

- Based should at all times be accessible to, *Makos*, .. 22635-61
 to Full Board, 1912, *Makos*, .. 23499-6
 on General question and only in one instance or so with particular case, *Elliot*, .. 16865-6
 Joint deputation with Gaelic League, particulars, *Makos*, .. 23372-4
 re Maternity rule received nominally by whole Board, *Elliot*, 16946-51; *Makos*, 23064-8
 Received by Dr. Starke, *Elliot*, 16874-8, 16897, 16903.
 not Received by any other members of Board than Dr. Starke, *Elliot*, .. 16881
 Refused hearing, *Makos*, .. 23217-8
 Refusal of Dr. Starke to receive certain members of organisation, and reason, *Elliot*, 16869-5; *Makos*, 23297-300, 23308.
 Refused hearing by Dr. Starke, *Makos*, 23180, 23219-24
 Dr. Starke's private secretary and sometimes one of Secretaries present, *Elliot*, 16882-3
 Verbatim Report, 1909, inadvertent omission of marking "private and confidential" particulars, *Makos*, 23360-72, 23388-9, 23427-30
 Commenced to proceed to London to interview Mr. Gerald Balfour, but inability to proceed grievances, *Makos*, 23180, 23187, 23216-7
 Distinction between Siles Congress and, *Makos*, 23312-6

FUND:

- Renowned, purely voluntary and subscription, *Elliot*, .. 16939-41
 Central, .. 16932
 and Object, *Elliot*, .. 16932
 Subscription, *Elliot*, .. 16938
 Defence:
 Date of establishment, and object, *Elliot*, 16932-7
 Subscription, *Elliot*, .. 16938
 Length of existence, *Elliot*, .. 16871
 Meetings, number held annually, *Elliot*, 16807-9, 16920
 Methods, *Makos*, .. 23082
 Programme drawn up by, in 1903, and presented to Dr. Starke, but rejected with exception of solitary subject, *Makos*, .. 23259
 Protestant managers only, dealt with, *Elliot*, 16860-1
 Relations with Board, *Makos*, .. 23609-11
 Resolution passed in 1904, re widening of breach between teachers and inspectors, *Makos*, 23261
 Secretary, *Elliot*, 16863
 Sub-Committee, methods, *Makos*, .. 23083
 Total membership, *Elliot*, .. 16862-4
 Treasurer, amount of business considerable, *Elliot*, 16820-61

J.

- JAMISON, THOMAS, B.A., Principal Teacher of Madrid Street National School, Belfast:
 17691-18025
 Personal career, .. 17591-906
 Personal merit mark, particulars, .. 17919-25
 Jordan, Owen; case of increment being lost because of no record of examination for one year, *Kewsey*, 20944-50

Junior Assistant Mistress, see under Teachers.

K.

- KEEGAN, T., Principal, Rosgreen National School, Clonmel: .. 20077-234
 Career, .. 20077-82
 Reprimand, particulars, and withdrawal, 20128-34, 20172-84, 20227-35

Keweenaw, Sir Patrick, friendly relations with teachers, *Mahon*, 23129-32

Kilbane, Miss Mary, dismissal, particulars, *MacSwiney* 23091-135, 23103-75

Kelly, Mr. :

Error in composition noticed by, as not marked, in exercises written that day, and time for correcting had not come, *McClaggan*, 16543-50

MARKING AT :

Lisburn School, *McClaggan*, 16452-6, 16467, 16468, 16509-24, 16530-34

Madrid Street School, Belfast, *Jamison*, 17911-12, 17923, 18044-6

Nicholson Memorial School, Lisburn, *Smyth*, 17734-5, 17736

Sydenham School, Belfast, *Gregg*, 18334, 18360-2, 18430-1, 18434-5

Reports on Belfast circuit, *Larmour*, 16689

Testimonial to bearing towards teachers by Mr. Greer, reply, *McClaggan*, 16575-82

Kelly, P. J. :

Allegation against Mr. McClaggan, reply, *McClaggan*, 16543-50

Attention drawn to fact that time table was not suspended in Lisburn school, and particulars, *McClaggan*, 16536-50

Change in standard in 1903, *McClaggan*, 16538-42; *Larmour*, 16695-6

did not examine children on school record, *McClaggan*, 16571-4

Documentary evidence to prove that on showing of Lisburn school should have got higher mark than "good" in 1903, *McClaggan*, 16430, 16482-98, 16584-98, 16651-5

Manner of addressing teacher harassing, *McClaggan*, 16571-4

MARKING AT :

Lisburn School, *McClaggan*, 16452, 16468, 16475-86, 16482-503, 16555, 16598, 16614-24

Madrid Street School, Belfast, *Jamison*, 17911-3, 17923

Resurrection School, *Keegan*, 20118-21, 20137-62

St. James's School, Belfast, *Larmour*, 16633-4, 16660-4, 16703

Sydenham School, Belfast, *Gregg*, 18349

Thurkington School, *Keegan*, 16234

Tullycavey School, *Anderson*, 18092-5

Tycomnaught School, Cahill, 17614, 17827-8, 17821, 17823, 17859-1

Mr. Smyth reported for not making record of punishment in Corporal Punishment Book, *Smyth*, 17735

Remarks in Observation Book of Newtownards Girls' School, *Todd*, 15404

Remarks in Observation Book of St. James's School, Belfast, *Larmour*, 16798

Reply to observations of, re St. James's School, Belfast, *Larmour*, 16727-40, 16744-61, 16798-300, 16828-9

Report on Belfast circuit, *Larmour*, 16689

Statement that errors in written work were not dealt with as suggested in Lisburn school, *McClaggan*, 16581-41

Statement that teacher of Lisburn School declined to teach elementary sciences, and facts, *McClaggan*, 16513-25

Testimonial to bearing towards teachers by Mr. Greer, reply, *McClaggan*, 16575-82

Varied in severity of inspections after 1906, *Boyd*, 16721-4

Kelly, Miss, illustration of marking by, *Rosney*, 21610-2

Kentown School, dismissal of teachers, particulars, *MacSwiney*, 23221-22

Kilberry School, delayed report, instance, *Mahon*, 23323

Kilmarney Congress, denunciation of Catholic teachers to stand by Form I and II, *Mahon*, 23329-69

Kilmore School, merit marks, particulars, *O'Flanagan*, 19990-20019, 20020-3, 20031-7, 20054-70

Kilmore Boys' School: effect of rule of boys under 7 being ineligible for enrolment in boys' school where there is no suitable mistress available, *O'Garra*, 18304-514, 18356-9

Merit marks awarded, particulars, *O'Garra*, 18711

Number of successes of pupils in public examinations, *O'Garra*, 18757-60, 18844-54, 18884-8

Referred to, in memorial, *Keegan*, 20196

Killybegs School, case instanced as showing school buildings influence merit marks, *Rosney*, 20983-90

Kilmahack School, delayed report, instance, *Mahon*, 23323

Kilroy School, case of appeal being refused, *MacSwiney*, 23223-30

Knockbridge School, dismissal of teacher, particulars, *MacSwiney*, 23206-20

Kyle, Mr., case of, *Edm.*, 17579-80

L

Ladley School, mark lowered on account of premises, *Todd*, 15960-1

Lambert, Mr., dismissal, particulars, *MacSwiney*, 23166-75

LANDERS, MAURICE, Principal of Blessington School: 21069-113

Career, 21066-70

Increment lost because of lowering of reports, *Larmour*, 21104-12

no Reduction in salary owing to lowering of marks, only reputation as teacher affected, 10708-1

LABOUR, JOHN EDWARD, Principal of St. James's School, Antrim Road, Belfast: 16640-433

Referred to as teacher, 16703

LABOUR CIRCUIT :

Deputation: 16689

Manner in which complaint was received and treated officially, 16709

Statement in reply to observations of Chief Inspectors, 16707-12

Lowering believed to be mainly due to fact that premises were now being taken into consideration, 16697

111 out of 404 schools protested, 16686

Re-inspection of whole of schools expected as result of memorial and deputation, 16687-94

Reports of inspectors from year 1901 on whole two circuits presided over by six inspectors handed in, 16688, 16689-1

Teachers striving to meet requirements of new programme, 16689-2

Wholesale reduction of marks in 1906, 16683-5, 16695-6

ST. JAMES'S SCHOOL, ANTRIM ROAD, BELFAST:

Manager has been doing best to get equipment, 16616-22

Merit marks, particulars, 16649-78, 16708

Observation book, extracts, 16703

no Overcrowding, 16610-12

Premises taken into account in awards of merit marks, 16648-78, 16727, 16742, 16796-9, 16813, 16823-6, 16827-9

Reply to Inspector's observations, 16714-91, 16796-306

School premises owned by members of congregation, 16816

Voluntary contributions towards upkeep, and inadequacy, 16670-6

Laundrywork, see Cookery, Laundrywork and Domestic Science under School Programmes.

Lavelle, Mr., reports on Belfast circuit, *Larmour*, 16689

LEAHY, PATRICK, Principal of Glenties School, Tipperary: 20696-557

Career, 20596

Letterhead School, case instanced as showing award of merit mark at time when children were not prepared for examination, *Rosney*, 21609-4

Lisburn Schools :

Hilden School, mark given by Mr. Kelly, particulars, *McClaggan*, 16583, 16614-24

Lowering of mark, particulars, *McClaggan*, 16451-492, 16596-630

NICHOLSON MEMORIAL SCHOOL :

Dismissals of teachers, particulars, *McClaggan*, 16436-46

Heating and cleaning and upkeep, no payment by teacher, *Smyth*, 17835-6

Merit Marks awarded to, particulars, *Smyth*, 17723-44, 17815-24, 17877-81

Lisburn Schools—continued.**Nicholson Memorial School—continued.**

Reports not Received for nearly two months after inspection of Lisburn school, *McClellan*, 16480-1

Statement of Inspector that teacher declined to teach Science in Lisburn school, and facts, *McClellan*, 16513-25

Time Tables, attention drawn four times to fact of non-compliance in Lisburn school, *McClellan*, 16526-30

Little, Robert :**Marking of :**

Illustration, *Ramsay*, 20944

Rosegreen School, *Reegan*, 20137, 20148

Logan, His Eminence Cardinal : appeal to, re-dismissal of teacher settled very satisfactorily, *MacSwiney*, 22505

Loughmore School :

Merit marks, particulars, *Nash*, 20238-41, 20243, 20256-60, 20271-301

Principal teacher, undergraded, and particulars, *Nash*, 20256-6, 20312-19

Visit of Dr. Starks, particulars, *Nash*, 20284-5, 20291-5

Visit of Dr. Starks, particulars, *Nash*, 20284-5, 20291-5

Lewtown Boys' School, Galbally :

Assistance afforded by manager in provision of school equipment, *E. O'Connell*, 16990-2

Backward tendency in mathematics, *E. O'Connell*, 16988-9

Criticism of Inspector on teaching of reading, *E. O'Connell*, 16537a-16537b, 16600-6

Criticism of time-table by Inspector, particulars, *E. O'Connell*, 16663-75

Constant changes in inspectors complained of, *E. O'Connell*, 16337-87a

Merit mark, particulars, *E. O'Connell*, 16540-692

Reprimand of teachers, particulars, *E. O'Connell*, 16593, 16513-25, 16950-2

Withdrawal of assistant's increment through adverse report on third year of incremental period, particulars, *E. O'Connell*, 16571-92, 16576-85

Withdrawal of assistant's increment through adverse report on third year of incremental period, particulars, *E. O'Connell*, 16571-92, 16576-85

Withdrawal of assistant's increment through adverse report on third year of incremental period, particulars, *E. O'Connell*, 16571-92, 16576-85

Withdrawal of assistant's increment through adverse report on third year of incremental period, particulars, *E. O'Connell*, 16571-92, 16576-85

Withdrawal of assistant's increment through adverse report on third year of incremental period, particulars, *E. O'Connell*, 16571-92, 16576-85

Withdrawal of assistant's increment through adverse report on third year of incremental period, particulars, *E. O'Connell*, 16571-92, 16576-85

Withdrawal of assistant's increment through adverse report on third year of incremental period, particulars, *E. O'Connell*, 16571-92, 16576-85

Withdrawal of assistant's increment through adverse report on third year of incremental period, particulars, *E. O'Connell*, 16571-92, 16576-85

Withdrawal of assistant's increment through adverse report on third year of incremental period, particulars, *E. O'Connell*, 16571-92, 16576-85

Withdrawal of assistant's increment through adverse report on third year of incremental period, particulars, *E. O'Connell*, 16571-92, 16576-85

Withdrawal of assistant's increment through adverse report on third year of incremental period, particulars, *E. O'Connell*, 16571-92, 16576-85

Withdrawal of assistant's increment through adverse report on third year of incremental period, particulars, *E. O'Connell*, 16571-92, 16576-85

Withdrawal of assistant's increment through adverse report on third year of incremental period, particulars, *E. O'Connell*, 16571-92, 16576-85

Withdrawal of assistant's increment through adverse report on third year of incremental period, particulars, *E. O'Connell*, 16571-92, 16576-85

Withdrawal of assistant's increment through adverse report on third year of incremental period, particulars, *E. O'Connell*, 16571-92, 16576-85

Withdrawal of assistant's increment through adverse report on third year of incremental period, particulars, *E. O'Connell*, 16571-92, 16576-85

Withdrawal of assistant's increment through adverse report on third year of incremental period, particulars, *E. O'Connell*, 16571-92, 16576-85

McEnery, Mr. :**marking by :**

Ballymacnab School, *Nash*, 20736, 20736

Calvin School, *Mansfield*, 21139, 21142-3

Glennahoe School, *Lecky*, 20690, 20695-15

Lewtown Boys' School, *Crewe*, 16585

Maryvale School, *Sweeney*, 16690-1, 16695-9

19615

Meagher School, particulars, *O'Mahony*, 19974

19635-5

Menard Boys' School, *O'Donnell*, 19761, 19649

19814, 19613, 19820

Rathgorman School, *Gidley*, 19660, 19627

Rosegrove School, *Keegan*, 20134, 20136

20149-50

Shewenagh Girls' School, *Berry*, 20467

Templemore School, *O'Grady*, 19699, 19650

McGlinchy, Edward, case instanced as showing

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

award of merit mark on scrappy inspections, *Ramsay*, 20965

M.

Maccuslay, H. A., case in which teacher was charged by inspector with disloyalty, and censured of, by Board and manner of investigation of matter, *Ramsay*, 21024-9

McCarthy, Mr., delayed report, instance, *Nash*, 21523

McCluggage, Thomas E., B.A., Principal, Hilden National School, Lisburn : 16431-16439

Dismissal from Nicholson Memorial School, Lisburn, particulars, 16439-46

Appeals, regarded by teachers as useless, 16626

Increment, should be automatic in absence of severe official censure, 16425

Inspectors, examination by, undesirable, and reasons, 16627

Lisburn Schools : lowering of mark, particulars, 16431-390, 16596-436

Hilden School, mark given by Mr. Kelly, particulars re, 16436, 16614-24

Merit Marks, abolition advocated, 16425-6

particular of dismissals of Teachers, Nicholson Memorial School, Lisburn, 16439-46

McCormack, Mr., dismissal, particulars, *MacSwiney*, 22260-2

McCormack, Mr., dismissal, particulars, *MacSwiney*, 22260-2

McCormack, Mr., dismissal, particulars, *MacSwiney*, 22260-2

McCormack, Mr., dismissal, particulars, *MacSwiney*, 22260-2

McCormack, Mr., dismissal, particulars, *MacSwiney*, 22260-2

McCormack, Mr., dismissal, particulars, *MacSwiney*, 22260-2

McCormack, Mr., dismissal, particulars, *MacSwiney*, 22260-2

McCormack, Mr., dismissal, particulars, *MacSwiney*, 22260-2

McCormack, Mr., dismissal, particulars, *MacSwiney*, 22260-2

McCormack, Mr., dismissal, particulars, *MacSwiney*, 22260-2

McCormack, Mr., dismissal, particulars, *MacSwiney*, 22260-2

McCormack, Mr., dismissal, particulars, *MacSwiney*, 22260-2

McCormack, Mr., dismissal, particulars, *MacSwiney*, 22260-2

McCormack, Mr., dismissal, particulars, *MacSwiney*, 22260-2

McNeill, Mr. :**marking of :**

Maddyke School, *Sweeney*, 19619-21, 19624

19690-2, 19693

Nicholson Memorial School, Lisburn, *Smyth*, 17772-8

McNeill, Mrs., case of, *SBist*, 17180

McNeill, Mrs., case of, *SBist*, 17180

McNeill, Mrs., case of, *SBist*, 17180

McNeill, Mrs., case of, *SBist*, 17180

McNeill, Mrs., case of, *SBist*, 17180

McNeill, Mrs., case of, *SBist*, 17180

McNeill, Mrs., case of, *SBist*, 17180

McNeill, Mrs., case of, *SBist*, 17180

McNeill, Mrs., case of, *SBist*, 17180

McNeill, Mrs., case of, *SBist*, 17180

McNeill, Mrs., case of, *SBist*, 17180

McNeill, Mrs., case of, *SBist*, 17180

McNeill, Mrs., case of, *SBist*, 17180

McNeill, Mrs., case of, *SBist*, 17180

McNeill, Mrs., case of, *SBist*, 17180

McNeill, Mrs., case of, *SBist*, 17180

McNeill, Mrs., case of, *SBist*, 17180

McNeill, Mrs., case of, *SBist*, 17180

McNeill, Mrs., case of, *SBist*, 17180

McNeill, Mrs., case of, *SBist*, 17180

McNeill, Mrs., case of, *SBist*, 17180

McNeill, Mrs., case of, *SBist*, 17180

McNeill, Mrs., case of, *SBist*, 17180

McNeill, Mrs., case of, *SBist*, 17180

McNeill, Mrs., case of, *SBist*, 17180

McNeill, Mrs., case of, *SBist*, 17180

MacSweeney, Con.—continued.

Barranisky School, dismissal of teacher, particulars	22991-135
Carryole School, dismissal of teacher, particulars	22176-86
Chapelized Girls' School, lowering of report in increment year, particulars	22248-54, 22291-4
Court School, reprimand and finding of teacher, particulars, and mode of conducting investigations	22324
Georley School, dismissal of teacher, particulars	22136-44

INCREMENTS:	
Annual, upon condition of giving efficient service and freedom from official censure desired	22311-4

Lowering of reports in increment years, cases and particulars	22233-53
should be more rapid in beginning, and should then slack off	22294-311

INSPECTORS:	
Chief, dismissals of teachers on investigation by, particulars	22205-23

General Inspection:	
should be near end of year	22322-4
Teacher should get notice of	22317-9
Insistence alleged by teachers, appeals refused	22334-2

Investigation of appeals in cases of dismissal by some authority independent of, desired	22049-73
--	----------

Kenttown School, dismissal of teachers, particulars	22221-2
---	---------

Kilnyohal School, case of appeal being refused	22223-39
Knockridge School, dismissal of teacher, particulars	22205-20

MERT MARKS:	
Lowering of, following visits from Dr. Starkie, cases	22136, 22138-62

Lowering of, in increment year, cases and particulars	22235-53
---	----------

Macklagh School, report lowered in increment year, particulars	22235-6
--	---------

Red Cross School, dismissal of teacher, particulars	22049-91
---	----------

Roselane School, lowering of report following visit of Dr. Starkie	22144-58
--	----------

Salaries, hiring wage early in life and top stationary desired	22294-311
--	-----------

School year, uniform, question of	22320-32
-----------------------------------	----------

TEACHERS:	
Charges:	
not Allowed to cross-examine	22224, 22279
Any kind of evidence taken	22285-78
Investigations conducted in such a way as to give no confidence in results	22285-87
should have opportunity of being properly defended	22284
no Report sent down by investigating officer	22287
should be Represented by solicitor	22281

Dismissals:	
Cases	22076-222
increase, question as to districts	22123
for inefficiency, no appeals granted	22225-6
Investigation by some authority independent of inspectors in charge of district desired	22049-73

Principals sometimes obtain employment as assistants	22333-5
--	---------

Insistence of inspectors alleged, appeal refused	22210-2
--	---------

Junior assistant mistresses not paid living wage, and consequences	22326-7
--	---------

should get Notice of Inspection	22317-9
---------------------------------	---------

Winkler, teachers, agitation respecting Rule 127(3), and managers memorialized	21961-90
--	----------

Case of criticism of inspector in Press, particulars	21864-18
--	----------

Madrid Street School, see under Belfast.

MAHER, D. C., B.A., Principal of Ardmoyle School, Cahel	20638-787
Career	20638-46

MAHON, MISS CATHERINE M., Principal, Carrig Mixed School; President of National Teachers' Organisation	22490-23538
Career	22490-519
Statement of representative teachers put in and will vouch for accuracy as President of Association	22029-38
Verbatim report of deputation to Dr. Starkie in 1909, inadvertent omission of marking "private and confidential," particulars	22389-9, 22427-59

APPEALS:

no Appeal	22535
-----------	-------

Attitude to be taken by Board and teachers, question of	22335-46
---	----------

Board should be divided into Sub-committees, and question of relation to Office committee	22799-829
---	-----------

Board's rule worthless and misleading	22548-9
---------------------------------------	---------

Every teacher should have right of, against unsatisfactory report	22142
---	-------

Granted no matter of favour in rare cases where manager is strong minded or determined	22535
--	-------

should be Heard and considered by whole Board and re-examination by higher official granted	22642
---	-------

should not be as a Matter of favour through influence of individual Commissioners	22547
---	-------

Procedure suggested	22631-2
---------------------	---------

Rarely refused before 1900	22285
----------------------------	-------

Referred to inspector charged	22233
-------------------------------	-------

Statement of Mr. Dilworth that appointment of Mr. Ward gave teachers additional means of access to Board, reply to	22547
--	-------

BOARD OF NATIONAL EDUCATION:

Access to, protest against refusal of, at Waterford Congress	22322
--	-------

Annual report, on sale, but not generally known to teachers	22040-25
---	----------

Attitude with regard to salaries	22317-21
----------------------------------	----------

Circulars referring to incidents alleged at Edge Congress	22301-3
---	---------

Closure to teachers at date of introduction of changes	22346-1
--	---------

Commissioners, blame put on Treasury for 12 years for financial wrongs to teachers before appointment of Committee	22507
--	-------

Conferences with inspectors and managers should be held	22532
---	-------

Deputations, from Teachers' Organisation after deputation to Mr. Balfour refused	22317-8
--	---------

Director and sub-director, appointment in place of Resident Commissioner desired	22781
--	-------

should be Divided into sub-committees, and question of relation to Office Committee	22719-829
---	-----------

Mal-administration	22484-7
--------------------	---------

Office Committee:	
Constitution suggested	22781-93

Relation to sub-committees, question of	22799-829
---	-----------

Only body hostile to National Teachers' Association	22043
---	-------

Representatives of teachers should at all times have free and friendly access to	22332
--	-------

Requires to be reformed, and personnel of administration changed, and suggestions	22754-829
---	-----------

Resident Commissioner:	
Abolition of office desired	22781

Role control placed in hands of	22248-50
---------------------------------	----------

Unhappy state of affairs largely due to unlimited powers being placed in hands of	22131-36
---	----------

RULES:	
of Administration, secret	22698-635

of Code and administration so far as effect interests of teachers should be published	22634-44
---	----------

of Code, published	22538
--------------------	-------

should be laid on table of House of Commons for 40 days	22944-50
---	----------

no New rule should be retrospective in such a way as to injure existing teachers	22944-83
--	----------

Retrospective, unlike any other branch of public or Government Service	22707
--	-------

Teachers should be treated according to, and not to official precedents	22996-23098
---	-------------

Two sets, rules of code and rules of administration	22596
---	-------

Mahon, Miss Catherine M.—continued.

Belfast circuit, inspectors, removal to other circuit advocated, ..	22925-40
Channel circuit, teachers not allowed to present appeal by deputation, ..	22487
Counsell management, resolution passed by, calling for Dr. Starke's removal, ..	22329-30
Development grant, allocation of local grants, question of, ..	22488-503
England, London County Council, procedure with regard to charges against teachers, ..	22597
Gaelic League, joint deputation with Irish National Teachers' Organisation to Education Office, particulars, ..	22373-4

GRADING:

Condemned by Dr. Traff, ..	22323
Grading of Assistant teachers, ..	22013-32
Standard numbers, abolition advocated, ..	22008-40

INCREMENTS:

Annual and automatic in absence of satisfactory report advocated, ..	22012-8, 22693, 22832-306
Delays, ..	22479-85
to at least top of third grade claimed for untrained teachers, ..	22660-76
Partial, practice, ..	22086-93
Rules not known to teachers, ..	22593-425
Teachers threatened with denial of, unless they introduced check, ..	22377-83

INSPECTION:

Administration responsible for inspectors' grievance of teachers, ..	22511-24
Annual examination:	
Children irregular in attendance might be excluded, ..	22660
should be Close examination, but in essential subjects each child should get questions, ..	22833-4
Combination of examination and inspection desired, ..	22632-45, 22652-6
should be Fixed day, ..	22627-39, 22646-63
In last month of school year advocated, ..	22832
Minimum number of attendances should be required before children admitted, ..	22830-3
should be by Teacher and inspector combined, ..	22834
Notice should be given to teachers, ..	22628-30
Appointments, should be mainly recruited from teachers, and should have certain number of years experience in teaching, and should have diploma, ..	22015-5
Comparison of old style with new, ..	22617-34
Conference with teachers and managers should be frequent, ..	22531-2
Incidental visits would show inspector working of school, ..	22632
should be Placed in charge of district and made responsible for certain number of years, ..	22629-31
should not Recommend change of organisation in school without giving practical illustration of how to carry it out, ..	22043-51
Surprise inspection, possible injustice, ..	22026

IRISH NATIONAL TEACHERS' ORGANISATION:

Appeal to King respecting extra week's Coronation vacation, to get answer from Board, ..	22497
Attitude of Dr. Starke towards, ..	22490-7
Concessions to teachers won without any practical help from Board, ..	22623-128
Deputations:	
Appointed to wait on Resident Commissioner in May, 1900, refused, ..	22186
to Board after deputation to Mr. Ballour refused, ..	22217-8
Board should at all times be accessible to, ..	22533-61
Commissioned to proceed to London to interview Mr. Gerald Ballour but inability to prevent grievances, ..	22180, 22187, 22216-7
to Full Board, 1912, ..	22480-5
Joint deputation with Gaelic League to Education Office, particulars, ..	22373-4
on Maternity question, ..	22084-8
Refusal of Dr. Starke to receive, on account of alleged instance at Sligo Congress, ..	22297-300, 22369

Mahon, Miss Catherine M.—continued.

on School programme refused hearing by Dr. Starke, ..	22219-24
Distinction between Sligo Congress and, ..	22312-4
Methods, ..	22088
Programme drawn up by, in 1900 and presented to Dr. Starke, but rejected with exception of solitary subject, ..	22259
Relations with Board, ..	22009-11
Resolution passed in 1904 respecting widening of breach between teachers and inspectors, ..	22391
Sub-committee, methods, ..	22063
Unconditional reinstatement of Mr. Mansfield in school in Cullen, claimed, ..	22513-8

MANAGERS:

Catholic, resolution calling for removal of Dr. Starke, ..	22347
Confidential reports on teachers objectionable, ..	22551-2

MARKS:

Abolition advocated, ..	22836
Bad, given by local inspector must remain even when raised on re-inspection, ..	22635
Entitling assistant teachers to promotion in exceptional circumstances an official secret as late as Dublin Congress, Easter, 1913, ..	22596-604
Nothing to show under which head school has failed, ..	22609-25
Promotion denied to one man on same marks that sufficed to obtain it for another man, ..	22704-7
Re-inspection refused in many cases where teachers have been unjustly treated, ..	22348-53a

Tone circular:	
should be Abolished as a chief factor, ..	22046
Condemnation of, ..	22057-66

OBSERVATION BOOK:

Abolition advocated, ..	22052-40
Cause of friction between teacher and inspector and serves no useful purpose, ..	22661-5

PROMOTION:

"Paper," abolition advocated together with standard numbers, ..	22036-49
Rules not known to teachers, ..	22598-625
by Scholarship, and efficiency suggested, ..	22604-27

REPORTS:

Adverse, should be cancelled and favourable substituted on re-inspection, ..	22041-2
Delay, instances, ..	22622-3
Delay in sending out from office, ..	22677-9
Full verbatim copy should be furnished to manager and teacher within a reasonable time, ..	22816-42
on Schools as a whole, advocated, ..	22836

SALARIES:

Board grant, allocation of, ..	22352a-8
Board's attitude in regard to, ..	22317-21
Fees for extras, ..	22706
Grant for increasing, promised by Mr. Birrell in 1906, ..	22337-8
Maximum should be reached in shorter time, and question of suggested scheme, ..	22832-906
School buildings, effect on increment and promotion, instances, ..	22826-8

SCHOOL PROGRAMME:

Essential subjects necessary to earn increment not known, ..	22722
Hurried training of teachers in new subjects, ..	22320-38
New subjects incapable of being dealt with successfully by old teachers, ..	22229-8

SCHOOLS:

Organisation, inspector should not recommend change of, without giving practical illustration of how to carry it out, ..	22043-51
Promotions of children should take place as a rule after examinations, but teacher's judgment should be supreme, and should be free to promote child at any time of year, ..	22834-4
Rule 127(b), storm of indignation at first publication, and modification and operation, ..	22361-66
School year, individual advocated, ..	22832
Sligo Congress, refusal of Dr. Starke to receive deputation on account of alleged incident at, ..	22297-300, 22369-16

Mahon, Miss Catherine M.—continued.

TEACHERS:

Administration has been one long period of civil war between Dr. Starke and, and statement respecting, . . . 23133-35
 Agreement forms for, discussed by Dr. Starke at deputation in 1907, . . . 23139-60
 Anonymous complaints against, investigated by Board, a procedure confined only to National Board, and instances, . . . 23578-80, 23519-22

Assistant:

Had better chance of promotion to principal under old rules, . . . 23613-32
 Marks entering to promotion in exceptional circumstances an official secret as late as Dublin Congress, Easter, 1915, . . . 22698-404
 Attack on, by Dr. Starke in address before British Association, . . . 23253-7
 Catholic, of Killarney Congress, decision to stand by Forster 1 and 2 of teacher's agreements, . . . 23330-66

Censures should not be given without teacher being given opportunity of defending himself, and being allowed to see report and charges laid against him, so that he might make defense, and in any case make appeal, . . . 23004-13
 Charges, not allowed to examine or cross-examine witnesses, . . . 23584-92

Civil Rights:

Should be Allowed same rights as subjects of King in any other part of British Dominion, . . . 23724-54
 Statement by Dr. Starke that managers were opposed to, and that Mr. Birrell did question more than that good, contradicted, . . . 23374, 23380-4

Dismissals:

In absence of sworn enquiry court of appeal should be formed for investigating grave charges involving, . . . 23443-60
 Death of inefficiency circular proved greater calamity than its birth, . . . 23169-77
 Denounced by Dr. Traill, . . . 23323
 Deputation to Chief Secretary, . . . 23548-53
 Increase in number, and lack of safeguards to teachers, . . . 23323-36
 for inefficiency, disadvantages of teachers charged with, and proposal, . . . 23375-420
 Rule 60, new and old, . . . 23565, 23559-80, 23561-71

Sworn enquiry in grave charges involving, question of, . . . 23581-96
 as systematic procedure to safeguard teacher in case of threatened, . . . 23249
 Dr. Starke tried to show in 1904 that they had no ground for grievance as compared with English teachers, . . . 23376

Financial demands upon, for school equipment, &c., . . . 23465-71

Friendly relations with former Resident Commissioners, . . . 23129-32

Label on, by Dr. Starke at Royal University Commission, . . . 23445-7

Maternity rate:

Board should provide substitutes, . . . 23475-82
 Teachers deprived of month's leave of absence allowed by Treasury in case of illness, . . . 23468-76

Parliamentary secretary for, explanation, . . . 23338-40

Penalties for inefficiency and falsification, circular issued under régime, and by authority of, Dr. Starke, . . . 23158-62

Penalties, scale always existed, but publication of circular in newspapers not calculated to raise teachers in public esteem, . . . 23162-8

Relations with Board, . . . 23099-11

Rural schools, effect of grading system, . . . 23716-21

Transition, memorial, and another attempt to gain redress, but still agitating, . . . 23258, 23348

Undergraded:

Claim for restoration of qualifications, . . . 23053-5
 In consequence of classification of teachers being done away with, . . . 23767-14
 Number, and injustice, &c., . . . 23189-215
 Untrained, increment to at least top of third grade claimed, . . . 23066-76
 Willing and anxious to co-operate with Dr. Starke in 1909, . . . 23178-89

Mahon, Miss Catherine M.—continued.

Time tables, specimen, for every class of school, should be sent from Education Office, and discussed at Conference, . . . 22831-2
 Tipperary, inspectors, removal to other circuits advertised, . . . 22928-40
 Waterford Congress, protest against refusal of access to Board, . . . 23322

Mahon, Mr.:

marking of:

Cortingswuna School, Fegarty, 19304-5, 19400-2
 Killenave School, O'Monagha, 20009-14
 Longmore School, Nash, 20248
 Rathgormack School, Guiry, 19471-2
 Templemoyle School, particulars, Nash, 20248-9.

Mahoonagh School:

Appeal, particulars, O'Callaghan, . . . 20840-56
 Mark marks, particulars, O'Callaghan, . . . 20797-807
 Operation of Rule 127(b), O'Callaghan, . . . 20810-39
 Maguire, D. K., case of, Ramsey, . . . 20027-39

Managers:

Annual examination should be held by inspectors, of which due notice should be given to, Couler, . . . 14788-87, 14683-91

Catholic, resolution calling for removal of Dr. Starke, Mahon, . . . 23247

Conferences with Board should be held, Mahon, . . . 22832

Conferences with inspectors and teachers should be frequent, Mahon, . . . 22831-2

Conference re scholarships to Intermediate from National schools, Elliott, . . . 16559

Confidential report on teachers: Abolished in 1911 and particulars, Elliott, . . . 18184-92, 17125-2

Objectionable, Mahon, . . . 23253-2

not consulted by Board on introduction of new scheme, Monaghan, . . . 21578-81

Correspondence of teachers with Board not admitted unless vouched by, Monaghan, . . . 21629-39

Duplicates of all school documents sent to, should be supplied to teachers, Ramsey, . . . 21058

Full reports should be furnished to, Ramsey, 21063, Mahon, 22838-42.

should be Given opportunity of being present at annual inspection, O'Monagha, 20056-5, 20064-7

Inspectors inclined to exasperate should not be promoted to higher ranks, Monaghan, . . . 21844

Notice of inspectors' visits, shortness of, and suggestion, Couler, 14663-75, 14794; Couler, 14812-30, 14879, 14926-32

Obligations for obtaining grant for heating and cleaning schools not always carried out, Elliott, . . . 16610-28

Presbyterian scheme to establish same form of arbitration, but not accepted, Elliott, . . . 16901-2

Pressure from, on office sometimes successful in getting teacher's promotion, Ramsey, 21030-2; Monaghan, 21185-90.

Protestant Bishops not in same position as Catholic bishops in regard to, Elliott, . . . 16998-900

Statement by Dr. Starke that they were opposed to civil rights, and contradiction, Mahon, . . . 23374, 23390-4

Teachers should be free to adopt any arrangement of Time Tables they please, with concurrence of, Ramsey, . . . 21058

Mangan:

D.:

Examination of Tyconnagh School in Irish, particulars, Cahill, . . . 17670-67

Marking of St. James' School, Belfast, Lormeur, . . . 16056, 16069

Remarks in Observation Book of St. James' School, Belfast, Lormeur, . . . 16703

Reply to Observations of, and reports re St. James' School, Belfast, Lormeur, 16714-27, 16742-3, 16809-9

J.:

Marking of St. James' School, Belfast, Lormeur, . . . 16703, 16703

Remarks in Observation Book of St. James' School, Belfast, Lormeur, . . . 16703

Reports on Belfast circuit, Lormeur, . . . 16899

Mangan, D.—continued.

Manning, Mrs., forwarding of report following visit of Dr. Starke, MacSweeney, 21130-32, 21133-4

MANSFIELD, E., Principal of Cullen National School, Acting-Secretary for Irish National Teachers' Organisation.

Board aware before dismissal that Mr. Welply was marking more severely than Mr. Brown in Cullen circuit, Deane, 21466-72

Commissioner cannot take steps to recommend re-statement and question, Maken, 21941-57

Dismissal, climax of agitation, Deane, 21459-62

Extracts from correspondence with Board, Deane, 21342

Grounds on which Board rejected first proposal for dismissal, question, Deane, 21430-4

Letters written as leading member of Teachers' Organisation, Deane, 21342

Matter twice before Board, Deane, 21343-4

Most serious point in first speech was attack on Dr. Starke by name and not what he said about Inspector, Deane, 21342

Number of members of Board present and numbers voting for and against, when dismissal of, was earned, question, Deane, 21350-52

Ordered to repudiate statements attributed to in Cullen Chronicle, and refusal, Deane, 21345-7

Reasons for having proposed dismissal, Deane, 21342

Re-consideration of matter by Board, question Deane, 21354-7

Rule governing and grounds for dismissal, question, Deane, 21358-403, 21433-40

Taken at disadvantage in having communication sent to him out of ordinary course of Board's procedure, question, Deane, 21363-83

Tone of letters one of cool and calculated impertinence that no body of directors could allow from subordinates, Deane, 21342

Unconditional re-statement in school in Cullen claimed by I.N.T.O., Maken, 21353-8

Whole thing would have been stopped had he withdrawn speech or qualified it, Deane, 21462

Evidence: 21114-950, 21359-48.

Cater, 21115-130

Case of, re promotion and increment, 21299-1

Correspondence with Mr. Welply re date of closing of school, particulars, 21236-46, 21269-70

Expenditure on school equipment, &c., 21269-16

Explanation of leaving out reference to Mr. Welply in appeal, 21423-9

Particulars of absence in Dublin for two days and cutting of salary and decrement of increment in consequence, 21360-411, 21379-4

Privileged letter to Board stating that opinion of teachers was that Mr. Welply was qualifying for chief inspectorship, unfairness on part of Mr. Hynes and particulars, 21430-41

Speech made at meeting at Cullen leading to removal by Board, particulars, 21709-809, 21882-3, 21890-8

Violation of rules of Board in speech at Cullen, question, 21801-10, 21826

Wife dismissed from position as assistant teacher at Cullen School on ground that all grants to school were to be withdrawn if successor to, were not appointed by manager, and particulars, 21826-38, 21899-401

Appeals, teachers have no faith in, but believe that they lead to further injustice, 21666-70

BOARD OF NATIONAL EDUCATION:

Anonymous charges against teachers investigated, 21630-6

Consulted neither teachers nor managers on introduction of new scheme, 21678-81

Correspondence with teachers not admitted unless vouched by manager, 21629-30

Examiners, men having practical experience should be put in place of, 21666

Information asked for respecting making of schools in Circuit 18, refused, 21577

Office administration, cost of, 21464-71

Power taken away from, as whole, and placed in hands of Dr. Starke, 21571

no Power on part of chief inspectors to enforce policy, 21563-7

Secretaries, one at least should have practical experience as teacher or inspector, or preferably both, 21674

Mansfield, E.—continued.

Reports, no teachers to be recommended for promotion whose schools are not above reproach in point of sanitation, 21538-39

Resident Commissioner has too much power, 21742-7

no Respect for vested rights of teachers, 21600-534

not Responsible to public opinion, nor to Parliament, 471-2

Returns to Parliament, re dismissals of teachers, false returns, 21489-9, 21575-4

Rules and Regulations, notice should be given to teachers, and should be laid on table of House of Commons before receiving sanction, 21420-2, 21474-80

Very little sympathy with teachers, 21537-63

Whole spirit of administration must be changed, 21636

CLOSMEL CIRCUIT:

Delay made by office, 21336

no Easy-going style of inspection prior to Mr. Welply's transfer, 21790-1

Influence of Mr. Welply over junior inspectors, and quotations from, should not carry weight, 21428

Information asked for, refused by Board, 21577

Meeting at Thurles, compliments of general discontent as to mode of inspection of Mr. Welply first heard of, 21303-6

Re-inspected by Mr. Hynes, but teachers refused any redress or recognition of wrong done, 21797-8

Resident Commissioner must have been aware of state of affairs in, even before memorial, 21733-3

Steps taken to memorialise Board respecting marking of Mr. Welply, particulars, 21795-7

Teachers:

Equal at least to those of any other circuit, 21303-8

Letter to Board suggesting transfer of Mr. Welply to vacancy in another circuit, 21362-62

not a Single teacher who signed memorial or who sent in statements of complaint filed by Board, and particulars, 21443-60

Statement that managers did not interfere memoranda, 21428

Statement that they were not prepared to give Mr. Welply a fair trial, refused, 21441

Thirteen schools re-examined, of which six only were included in memorial, 21441-4

CULLEN SCHOOL:

Assistant teacher dismissed from position on ground that all grants to school were to have withdrawn if successor to Mr. Mansfield were not appointed by manager, 21839-38, 21899-401

Ment marks, particulars, 21131-308, 21330-50

Visit of Dr. Starke, particulars, 21330-41

England, teachers, freedom in civil rights, 21893-3

GRADERS:

Average necessary for promotion to higher, should be abolished, 21675-6

First, first of, teachers entitled to promotion cannot get, 21675

Standard numbers should be abolished, 21675

INCREMENTS:

should be Annual and automatic, 21675, 21676, 21829-42, 21899

Delayed when deserved in ordinary way, 21697-11

Delays in awarding and pressure necessary to secure, 21478

Increase has not kept pace with cost of living, 21675, 21684-6

Partial, 21655-7

Inspection system, cost of, 21494-71

INSPECTORS:

Annual inspection:

Combination of examination with inspection advocated, 21687, 21698

Portion of examination might be done by teacher, 21698

Mansfield, E.—continued.

Inspectors—continued.

Teacher should have power to withdraw abnormally dull, or very irregular children, 21638

a Year or thereabouts should be allowed, 21635

Appointment:

by Competition advocated, 21640
should be sent Outdoors, and not all National teachers, 21677-79

Practical experience in teaching, and teaching or training diploma required, 21639, 21641-4

Service marks should count, 21641

Chief, no power to criticise policy of Board, 21563-7

District, revision to system desired, 21663-5

Head, revision to system desired, 21663-5

Inclined to exonerate teachers and managers, should not be promoted to higher ranks, 21644

should show desire to sympathise and co-operate with teachers, 21644

Surprise visits should not be outside hours mentioned in time table, 21656

Managers, promotions gained by pressure of, 21635-60

Merit Marks:

Abolition advocated, 21638

Complaints of Mr. Cole lowering all round ignored by Board, and question as to responsibility for calling attention to, 21616-29

Dragged down by work of assistant, 21690-1

Evidence in support of statement of chief inspector that adverse circumstances daily considered and rather favour teachers, 21734-5

no Tendency of inspectors to deal leniently in third year, 21745-54

Time taken by inspectors to decide, question of, 21737-9

"Tone" circular, 21739-43

Usually correspond with mark of principal teacher, 21287-9

Observation book could be dispensed with altogether, 21644, 21647-9

Promotions:

Delays in awarding, and pressure necessary to secure, 21675

Partly on scholarship, and partly on service, desired, 21676

Pressure of managers, 21635-60

Promises regarding, under old rules of Board completely ignored when introducing new system, in 1900, 21673-65

Reports, delays in office in sending out, 21603-4

Salaries:

Assistant teachers should not be confined to lower grade, 21676

Contrast between old and new systems, 21616-9

much too low in proportion to importance of work, 21675

Monthly payment advocated, 21676-83

Regret issued by Board in 1904 trying to institute comparison with Great Britain and to make out that salaries were good considering size of schools, 21637

Teachers not satisfied with, 21633-60

School Programme:

Anonymous document regarding grouping, chief inspector concerned for ordering, 21635-62

Constant shifting and changing, 21633-6

Modified not submitted by teachers, and reason, 21633-4

Overloaded, 21633

Schools:

no Real co-ordination with secondary schools, and suggestions, 21771-88

Small:

Amalgamation of, by Rule 127(b) and loss to teachers, 21613-7

Multiplication, commissioners responsible for, 21612

Teachers:

Assistant, slow promotion to second grade, 21532-5

Mansfield, E.—continued.

Candidates:

Considerable deterioration in qualifications, 21603-712

Free for Latin and French should be paid so as to give schools that do not take up Irish an opportunity to qualify as, 21712-6

Number of, in training, 21700-2

Discontent widespread and not confined to any particular district, 21794

Encouragement should be given to study Irish, 21712-20

Freedom to discuss political matters would be advantage, 21884-9

should get Fall reports, 21644-68

no Ignorance of conditions under which they work, 21599-606

Implication of chief inspectors that dissatisfaction is confined to one or two counties or agitates, contradicted, 21723-38

in Irish-speaking districts, injustice of bilingual programme, 21525-36

Junior assistant mistresses, rule introduced that they should go when average rose above 50, and injustice and question of employment, 21500-34

Loss to, under amalgamation of small schools under Rule 127(b), 21613-7

Maturity rule, vested rights of teachers interfered with, 21498-560

Notice of annual inspection should be given to, 21635, 21636

Principal, no control over assistants, 21289-87, 21291, 21643-3

Statement that teachers would not suffer a penny from introduction of new system but saving of £50,000 per annum through, question of, 21507-43

of Superior qualifications and long and efficient service should be promoted from smaller to larger schools, 21674

Training, blundering respecting, 21618-28

should be trained more, 21635

Mansfield, Mrs., withdrawal of salary, particulars, Mansfield, 21829-32, 21899-901

Martyke School:

Average attendance, Sweeney 1876 3-9

Distance of other schools from, Sweeney 19710-2

Effects of report on teacher's salary, Sweeney 19650

Loss of movement owing to lowering of mark, Sweeney, 19725-6

Merit mark given by Mr. Walsby left as it was by Mr. Hynes, Keegan, 20205

Merit marks, particulars, Sweeney, 18590-638, 19713-58

Mixed school, Sweeney 19702

Observation Book, suggestions no help, Sweeney, 19755-8

One room, Sweeney, 19721-4

Promises good, but old, Sweeney 19720

Re-examination appealed for but refused, and particulars, Sweeney, 19628-31, 19664, 19673-9, 19723-4

Referred to in memorial, Keegan, 20198

Reprimand of teacher, Sweeney, 19625-7

Visit of Dr. Stokes and Mr. Dilworth, Sweeney, 19633-8

Mathematics, see under School Programme.

Meagher, Mr., dismissal, particulars, MacSweeney 21296-7

Merit Marks:

Abolition advocated, Todd, 18392-7, 15687; O'Connell, 14351-3; McCullagh, 14625-8; Sullivan, 17290-2, 17233-6, 17251-6; Carter, 17480; Owens, 18213; Ramsey, 21058; Mansfield, 21633; Mahon, 21836

Appeals, see that title.

Asgham School, MacSweeney, 21972-3

Bad, given by local inspector, must remain even when raised on re-inspection, Mahon, 22585

Ballydoone, MacSweeney, 21189-92, 22163-4; Ballydoone School, Todd, 14971-2

Merit Marks—continued.

BRIEF CASES:

- Fall in marking considered due to secret instructions to inspectors from Board, Todd, 15915-29, 15957-9, 15973-83; Boyd, 15728-32.
 no Fall in efficiency of teachers corresponding to, Todd, 15933
 47 per cent. of schools reduced, Todd, 14985-68, 14972-14914, 15029-31, 15288-311, 15441-4, 15460-7.
 Mr. Hynes considered most of evil, but not opinion personally, Todd, 15023-8
 Injustice having arisen from examination having taken place early in uniform school year, Todd, 15125-3, 15139-43
 Leniency of marking prior to 1909, because programme was new to teachers, question of, Todd, 15032-7
 Lowering believed to be mainly due to fact that premises were now being taken into consideration, Larrover, 16097; Todd, 15688-124.
 no Redress given to teachers in cases where mark was raised on re-inspection, Boyd, 15940-5, 15948-9
 more Reductions than statistics showed known of whose teachers refused to sign because they thought they would be penalised afterwards, Todd, 15867-8
 Reports of inspectors from year 1901, on whole two circuits provided over by six inspectors handed in Larrover, 16098, 16330-1
 Rise in marking alleged by chief inspector to be due to recent appointment of junior assistant masters, and reter, Todd, 15232-4
 Removal of inspector, because of marking too soft, question, Boyd, 16028-32
 Blessington Boys' School, Lenders, 21071-113
 Cases of interference with personal mark of principal teacher, Rosney, 20037-49
 Case of teacher now in Canada, always losing increment by reason of reduction of, in third year, Rosney, 20921-5
 CLEVER CASES:

Merit Marks—continued.

CLEVER CASES—continued.

- Dundonald School, Todd, 14381-81
 Enlisting assistant teachers to promotion in exceptional circumstances, an official secret as late as Dublin Congress, Easter, 1913, Mahon, 22598-404
 Evidence in disproof of statement of chief inspectors that adverse circumstances only considered rather favour teachers, Mansfield, 21784-6
 46 out of 90 schools having lost money through lowering of, Elliott, 17364-6
 Glenhase School, Lecky, 20690-57
 Goringstown school, Rosney, 19334-432
 Hidden School, McTigue, 16698, 16614-24
 Illustrations of awarding an examination at times, when children were not prepared, Rosney, 21096-4
 Illustration of awarding, on scrappy inspection, Rosney, 20993, 21097-9
 Illustration of typical case, Rosney, 20927-30
 Instance of teacher adopting one inspector's methods only to find they were repudiated, Rosney, 22324-63, 22328-40
 Injustice arising from examination taking place early in uniform school year, Todd, 15173-7, 15417-9
 Inspector should not read former reports until he has written up his own, Gwry, 14712; Cross, 14940-13.
 Isham School, McTigue, 16451-590, 16340-630
 Local conditions and changed conditions of schools should be taken into account, Cross, 14853-7
 Longmore School, particulars, Nash, 20238-41, 20245, 20256-59, 20271-301.
 Lowering of, following visits from Dr. Sturges, cases, Rosney, 22136, 22138-62
 Lowering of, in increment year, cases and particulars, Rosney, 22233-53
 Louth Boys' School, Galbally, E. Cross, 18340-402
 Madril Street School, Belfast, Jameson, 17607-18448
 Mardys School, Rosney, 18390-638, 19713-68
 Mahonagh School, O'Connell, 20767-897
 Meador Boys' School, O'Donnell, 19781-8, 19813-54; Macklugh School, Rosney, 22253-6
 Mullinahone School, Keegan, 20208
 Newmarket Girls' Model School, Todd, 15404
 Noholme Memorial School, Limerick, Smyth, 17723-84, 17815-24, 17877-81.
 Nothing to show under which head school has failed, Mahon, 22600-25
 Oldtown Boys' School, Co. Cork, Rosney, 20803-9
 PERSONAL:

Merit Marks—continued.

- Sydenham School, Belfast, particulars, Gregg, 18336-438, 18443-527.
System not always fair or just estimate of work done in school, Gregg, .. 18393, 18414.
Tomboroona School, Keegan, .. 20234.
Teachers should have power of appealing for re-examination by higher official, Carter, .. 17388-90.
Templeton School, O'Grady, 19891-980, 19969-85.
Templeton School, Noid, .. 20248-9.
No tendency of inspectors to deal mercifully in third year, Mansfield, .. 21743-54.
Time taken by inspectors to decide, question of, Mansfield, .. 21737-9.
Tone circular, Crooke, 14847-50, 14857-67; Todd, 15594-6; Mansfield, 21739-43; Mahon, 23057-60, 23049.
Tullycavey School, Anderson, 18073-80, 18286-40, 18273-83.
Troughmought School, Cahill, 17614-63, 17767.
Unofficial question, Costello, 14643-54, 14710-12, 14743, 14780-01, Crooke, 14824-9, 14847-48, Todd, 15312.
at variance with general report, instances, Ramsey, 21600-16.
Withdrawal of cases shewing award of, at variance to general report, in absence of full report, Ramsey, .. 21614.
Mervyn, Mr. case of clearing and up-keep of school house by teacher, Elliott, 18998-10, 17284-9.
Micks, Mr., dismissal, particulars, MacSwiney, 22166-73.
- Mohober School :**
Assistant deprived of necessary conditions for promotion, O'Mahony, .. 19714-81.
Junior infants on rolls, O'Mahony, .. 19108-9.
Loss of promotion to principal teacher through merit mark, O'Mahony, .. 19071-4, 19089.
Merit marks, particulars, O'Mahony, 18971-19128; Keegan, 20208.
Observation Book, observations by Mr. F. J. Fitzgerald, contradicting Mr. Welby's statement, O'Mahony, .. 19038-42.
a One-roomed school and unsuited for cooking, O'Mahony, .. 19096-8.
Referred to, in memorial, Keegan, .. 20202.
School Attendance Act in force in district, O'Mahony .. 19109-1.
Visit of Dr. Starke, particulars, O'Mahony, 18969-19114.
- Monard Boys' School :**
Application of manager for exemption from Rule 127 (b) on ground that position of assistant would be endangered through non-enrolment of boy under seven years, particulars, O'Donnell, 19788-803.
Assistant, losses caused, particulars, O'Donnell, 19804-7.
Merit mark given by Mr. Welby left as it was by Mr. Hynds, Keegan, .. 20209.
Merit marks, particulars and description of assistant teacher as most indifferent teacher complained of, O'Donnell, .. 19781-3, 19813-54.
Referred to in memorial, Keegan, .. 20209.
Reports from 1890, O'Donnell, .. 19810-1.

Monitors :

- Criticism lessons established by circular, Elliott, 16973, 17068-71.
Some teachers do without, as trouble considered too great for any advantage received from services, Elliott, .. 16973.
Teachers required to devote extra time to instruction for which they receive no pecuniary reward, Elliott, .. 16973.
Moriarty, Mr., dismissal, particulars, MacSwiney, 22166-78.
Moran, J., LL.D., reports on St. James' School, Belfast, Larnmore, .. 16703.
Moyowakey School, instance of injustice of inspection, Maher, .. 20737-38.
Morris, Mr., case of, Elliott, .. 17239.
Mountshannon School, teachers notice of dismissal given by manager without any grave fault, and particulars, O'Callaghan, .. 20679-87.

- Myers School, case in which teacher was charged by inspector with discourtesy and censure of teacher by Board and manner of investigation of matter, Ramsey, .. 21024-9.
Mucklagh School, report lowered in incremental year, particulars, MacSwiney, .. 22233-6.
Mullary, Mr., marking and report on Blessington Boys' School, Lander, .. 21974.
Mullmahone School : merit mark given by Mr. Welby raised by Mr. Hynds, Keegan, .. 20208.
Referred to in memorial, Keegan, .. 20192-3.
Makens, Miss Nora, dismissal, particulars, MacSwiney, .. 22136-44, 22166-73.
Murphy, Mr., dismissal, particulars, MacSwiney, 22160-73.
Murphy, Mr., inspection of Chapelwood School, particulars, MacSwiney, .. 22248-54, 22291-4.

N.

- NASH, J. R., Principal of Templeton School, County Tipperary, member of Executive of National Teachers' Organisation :** 20258-321.
Caret, .. 20235-7.
Entitled to special promotion, but did not get, 20302-1.
Grade, .. 20242-4.
Grades, vested interests of teachers ignored, 20250.
Increments, annual and not to be withheld except in cases of inefficiency or dereliction of duty, advocated, .. 20250.
Inspectors, teaching experience necessary, 20322-3.
Junior assistant mistresses, case of vested rights of teachers being ignored in making rules, 20341-51.
- LOUGHMORE SCHOOL :**
Merit marks, particulars, .. 20236-68.
Mark given by Mr. Welby lowered by Mr. Hynds, and particulars, 20238-41, 20245.
Principal teacher ungraded, and particulars 20250-6, 20312-18.
Visit of Dr. Starke, particulars, 20284-5, 20291-5.
Primary education, new scheme, hardships having arisen would have been avoided if due notification had been given of intended change, and if abnormal cases specially investigated, .. 20250.
Salaries, unfair and inequitable fixing of, in 1900, 20250, 20324-40.
Teachers, estranged relations with Commissioners, several cases, .. 20250.
Templeton School, merit mark, particulars, 20248-9.
- National Education Board, see Board of National Education.**
National Schools, see under Schools.
Nature study, see under School Programmes.
Newell, Mr., illustration of marking by, Ramsey, 20083-8.
Newtownards Girls' Model School, mark lowered on account of assistant teacher, particulars, Todd, 15464.
Newtown School, Tipperary, case of investigation by Board of anonymous charge against teacher, Mahon, .. 23519.
Nicholls, Mr., marking of Shoredanagh Boys' School, Berry, .. 20573-6.
Nicholson Memorial School, see under Lisburn.

O.

- O'Brien, Mr., withdrawal of increment through adverse report on third year of incremental period, particulars, Crooke, .. 18571-92, 18574-83.
- Observation Book :**
could be dispensed with altogether, Mansfield, 21644, 21947-9; Mahon, 23053-60.
Cause of friction between teacher and inspector and serves no useful purpose, Mahon, 23061-5.
Exact copy by carbon paper, one to be left in school and one sent to Board would satisfy teachers, Todd, .. 18433-41.
Inspectors should consult with teachers previous to writing in, Crooke, .. 14844-5.
Inspector should not read former reports in, until he has written up his own, Costello, .. 14712.

Observation Book—continued.

Inspectors' observations should partake of encouragement and suggestions, *Rossey*, 21053
 Main use for succeeding inspector, but inspector should make report on what he finds in school, and not on what was previously put in, *Todd*, 16432
 Suggestions of very little use or consequence to teachers, *Todd*, 15429-31; *Anderson*, 18304-6; *Grogg*, 18191-5
 would tend to prevent misunderstanding if no entry was made in without inspector having talk to teacher on subject of proposed observation, *Anderson*, ... 18261-5

O'CALLAGHAN, GEORGE, Principal of Mahonagh School, Newnash, County Limerick:
 20788-837
 Career and grading, ... 20788-87

O'Connell, Mr. :

Marking by :
 Ballymacarrett Road School, Belfast, *Todd*, 14978
 Madrin Street School, Belfast, *Jamison*, .. 17957
 Sydenham School, Belfast, *Grogg*, 18351, 18353, 18447, 18450, 18457-9
 Tullymore School by, *Anderson* .. 18168-8
 Personal merit mark awarded by, particulars, *Jamison*, ... 17916
 Report on Belfast circuit, *Lansdown*, .. 16649

O'Connor, T. P. :

Marking of Anghrim School, MacFurey, .. 21974
 Reports on St. James' School, Belfast, *Lansdown*, 16703.

O'DONNELL, MICHAEL, Assistant Teacher, Monard Boys' National School, County Tipperary :
 Career, ... 19759-19854
 Career, ... 19759-80

O'FLANAGAN, MICHAEL, Principal of Kilmessue National School, County Tipperary :
 Career, ... 19865-20076
 Financial loss from marking of school, 20074-6

O'GORMAN, MICHAEL, B.A., Principal of Kilmessue National School :
 Career, ... 18693-18948
 Career, ... 18693-708, 18948
 no Knowledge of personal merit mark, 18943-6

O'GRADY, MICHAEL, Principal of Templemore National School, County Tipperary : 18655-985
 Career, ... 18656-64
 Grade, question of, ... 18667-40
 History of publichouse being kept by wife, 18661-8

O'MAHONY, MICHAEL, Principal of Mohobur National School, County Tipperary : 18649-19158

Career, ... 18649-70, 19129-32
 not trained under Board, and particulars re education, ... 19072-3, 19122-25
 Demerit, particulars, *MacFurey*, .. 22166-76

O'Riordan, Mr. :

Marking of :
 Mohobur School, *O'Mahony*, 18974-19082-5
 Templemore School, *O'Grady*, .. 19060
 Ormeau Road School, see under Belfast.

OWENS, PATRICK, B.A., late Principal of Rossmore National School :
 Career, ... 19159-19310
 Career, ... 19159-80, 19292
 Letter from Board re conduct in neglect of teaching monitors, particulars, 19194-201, 19258-68

P.

Pedley, Mr., reports on Ballymacarrett Road School, Belfast, *Todd*, ... 18251
 Pembroke, Father T. A., O.S.B., President, Rockwell College, opinion on Tipperary Schools, *Keegan*, 20117, 20234; *Mansfield*, 21357, 21361-3.

Primary Education :

Board consulted neither teachers nor managers on introduction, new scheme, *Mansfield*, 21573-21
 Comparison of standard with that under Results system, *Grove*, 14914-6; *Todd*, 15145-57, 15238-9, 15309-12; *Cole*, 17098-709
 Hardships having arisen would have been avoided if due notification had been given of intended change and if abnormal cases were specially investigated, *Naik* 20250
 no improvement under present system, and boys and girls by no means as well fitted as before to face the world, *Owens* 19282
 Local interest not possible under highly centralized system, *Robertson*, ... 16112-2
 New system, working out of, *Rossey*, .. 21063
 System raising education of country, *Grove*, 14921
 Progress book, inspectors should not question beyond work recorded in, *Anderson*, .. 18159

Promotion :

of Assistant Teachers to 2nd grade, *Lansdown*, *Mansfield*, ... 21552-6
 Barriers to, *Elliot*, ... 16973
 Claim to priority of, to younger teachers of shorter service, *Rossey*, ... 20900-16
 Denied to one man on same marks that sufficed to obtain it for another man, *Mahon* .. 22706-7
 should depend on length of service, efficiency, and should be automatic in absence of unsatisfactory reports, *Rossey*, ... 21038-41
 should not depend on merit marks, *Rossey*, 21056
 should depend on some sort of examination or test, *Owens*, ... 19214, 19217-30, 19231
 Delays in awarding, and pressure necessary to secure, *Mansfield*, ... 21675
 Necessary for appeals would be largely done away with if, did not depend on reports, *Anderson*, .. 18260

Old system preferred, *Owens*, ... 19217
 "Paper," abolition advocated together with standard, *Mahon* 23030-40
 Partly on scholarship and partly on service claimed, *Mansfield*, ... 21836
 Pressure from manager on office sometimes successful, *Rossey*, 21030-2; *Mansfield*, 21385-60.
 Promises regarding, under old rules of Board completely ignored when introducing new system in 1900, *Mansfield*, ... 21373-85
 Report of Board that no teacher was to be recommended for, whose school was not above reproach in point of sanitation, *Mansfield*, 21039-62.

Rules not known to teachers, *Mahon*, 23068-625
 by Scholarship and efficiency, suggested, *Mahon*, 23060-27.

Too slow, *Owens*, ... 19215, 19271-2
 see also Grades and increment

Protection Bishops, not in same position in regard to managers as Catholic Bishops, *Elliot*, 16896-900
 Purcell, Mr. evidence referred to, *Smyth* .. 17785
 Purser, Mr.

Letters from, read as evidence that appeals do not reach Board, *Mansfield* 21066-70
 marking in Belfast circuit, *Todd*, .. 16288
 Statement that inspectors were cause of failure of Results system denied by, *Boyd*, 16794-8

Q.

QUINN, RICHARD,

Principal of Rathkevin School, County Dub.
 Career 20332-456
 Entitled to promotion 20359-61
 Entitled to promotion 20359-61
 Promotion lost through lowering of mark, 20364-5

R.

RAMSEY, GEORGE, Principal of Oldtown Boys' school, Corktown: Representative of Irish National Teachers Organisation, Member of Central Executive Committee : 20888-21065
 Career 20888-97
 Priority of promotion to younger teachers of shorter service claimed 20900-46
 Grades, should be abolished, .. 21058, 21062-5

Ramsay, George—continued.

INCIDENTS:

- Animal and automatic when no serious reprimand is merited, determined by length of service, advocated, .. 21038-41, 21038
 Case of teacher now in Canada always leaving, by reason of reduction of merit mark in third year .. 20921-5
 Cases of teachers being done out of a year's, owing to no examination being held for one year .. 20931-54

INSTRUCTIONS:

- Discourtesy to teachers, instances, .. 21013-23
 Examinations, carrying on, beyond school hours, practice common, .. 20966-9
 Examinations as such should be discouraged, .. 21058

Managers, duplicates of all school documents sent to, should be supplied to teachers, .. 21058

MERE MARKS:

- Abolition advocated .. 21008
 Awarding on examination at time when children were not prepared, illustrations of, .. 21006-4
 Awarding on scatty inspection, illustrations of, .. 20995, 21007-9
 Typical cases, illustration of, .. 20927-30

PERSONAL:

- of Assistants, question as to interference with, by merit mark of school .. 20949-75
 of Principal, cases of interference with, by merit mark of school, .. 20957-69
 School building or other things interfering with, as well as efficiency, cases .. 20975-94
 at variance with general report, instances, .. 21003-16
 Withdrawal of cases showing award of, at variance to general report, in absence of full report .. 21010
 Observation books, inspectors observations should portake of encouragement and suggestions, .. 21058

OLDEN BOW'S SCHOOL, COVENTRY:

- Merit Marks, particulars, .. 20809-9
 Principal teacher, income .. 20917-8
 Primary Education, new system, working out of, .. 21058

PROMOTION:

- should depend on length of service and efficiency, and should be automatic in absence of unsatisfactory reports, .. 21038-41
 Pressure from manager on office, sometimes successful .. 21090-2

REPORTS:

- Full, should be furnished to managers and teachers, .. 21058
 Promotion and increment should be automatic in absence of unsatisfactory, .. 21038-41, 21058
 School Equipment, some provision should be made for supplying free books, stationery, &c. .. 21058

SCHOOL PROGRAMME:

- Agriculture, teaching in country schools, advocated, .. 21003
 Suitable to various schools should be arranged, .. 21038

TEACHERS:

- Candidates, entrance examination should be stiff, .. 21058
 Case of inspector charging with discourtesy and censure of, by Board, and manner of investigation of matter .. 21024-9
 Concession of full over liberty claimed .. 21058
 Discourtesy spreading .. 21054-8
 Encouragement and reward should be given for increased scholarship, .. 21058
 should get notice of annual inspection, .. 21042-57
 should be permitted to see all "Instructions to Inspectors" .. 21058
 Training, radical change needed, .. 21058
 Views entertained by, as to effects of abolition of Results system .. 21058
 Time tables, teachers should be free to adopt any arrangements they please, with concurrence of managers, .. 21058

Rathkerrin School:

- no Appeal and reasons, Quinn .. 20386-9
 Loss to teacher over repairs and equipment, Quinn .. 20447-9
 Merit marks, particulars, Quinn, 20392-82, 20393-3, 20412-7, 20426-43, 20453-9.

Rathgorman School:

- Merit marks, particulars, Guffy, 19466-518, 19528, 19533-75.
 Referred to, in memorial, Keegan, .. 20195
 Ravenscroft School, see under Belfast.
 Reading, see under School Programme.
 Red Cross School, dismissal of teacher, particulars, Macdonney .. 22060-91
 Redington, St. Hon. T. C., friendly relations with teachers, Mahon .. 23129-32

REPORTS:

- Adverse, should be cancelled and favourable substituted on re-inspection Mahon 23041-2
 Appeals against, see that title.
 Belfast circuit, from year 1991, on whole two circuits presided over by six inspectors handed in, Lawson, .. 10498, 10499-1
 Delay in forwarding, Quinn, 20383-4; Mansfield, 21001-6; Mahon, 22677-9.
 Delay, instances, Mahon .. 23522-3
 Entirely, and abolition of merit mark advocated, Elliot .. 21253-9
 Extracts only sent to teachers, Todd, .. 15445-7
 Full, should be furnished to managers and teachers Ramsay, 21003; Mansfield, 21044-53; Mahon, 22838-42.

GENERAL:

- Merit marks at variance with, instances, Ramsay, .. 21006-16
 Substitution of, for merit marks advocated, Todd .. 15393-7, 15467
 Withdrawal of cases showing award of merit marks at variance to, in absence of full Reports, Ramsay .. 21016
 Incidents should be annual and automatic in absence of adverse, Todd, 15396-7, 15467, 15588-90; Boyd, 15576-80, Robertson, 16097-100;
 McClellan, 16023; Elliott, 17235, 17240-5;
 Carter, 17474-9; Smyth, 17796-7, 17848-52;
 O'Grady, 18817-8; Owens, 19217-30, 19274-80; Nash, 20250; Ramsay, 21038-41, 21058;
 Mansfield, 21615, 21676, 21920-42, 21950;
 Macdonney, 22311-6; Mahon, 22972-6, 22993, 22993-995.
 Inspector should not read former, until he has written up his own, Cross, .. 14263-13
 Necessary for appeals would be largely done away with, if increment and promotion did not depend on, Anderson .. 18266
 Promotion and increment should be automatic in absence of unsatisfactory, Ramsay, .. 21038-41
 on Schools as a whole advocated, Mahon 22836
 Statement that teacher received, within one month of date of inspection, controverted, Boyd, 17858-90.
 Teachers should be allowed to see, when censured, Mahon, .. 23004-12.

Results System.

- Comparison with present system, Cross, 14918-9;
 Todd, 15145-57, 15398-9, 15409-12; Calkill, 17088-795; Smyth, 17837-62.
 Views entertained by teachers as to effects of abolition, Ramsay, .. 21058

- ROBERTSON, J. L., LL.D., Senior Chief Inspector, Scotland: .. 15967-16430
 Increment, annual preferable to triennial, 16993-100
 Inspectors, division of work into circuits, opinion as to arrangement .. 16264-5
 Primary education, local interest not possible under highly centralized system .. 16112-3
 Purge:
 should not be kept down another year in same class .. 16213-5
 Promotion, should not be restricted to beginning of school year .. 16219-2
 Results, fixed and completely independent of results of inspection desirable .. 16231-3

Robertson, J. L.—continued.

Scottish:	
Bursars, particulars	10381-4
Education, keen local interest	10111
Education department:	
Accessible to all complaints on part of managers and teachers or parents	10303-20
Change in regulations, procedure	10109-77
Circulars issued to inspectors	10161-7
Official staff, visits to schools, question, ...	10145-60
Permanent Secretary, comparison of position with Resident Commissioner in Ireland, question	10343-7
Proportion of work done in London and in Edinburgh, question, ...	10246-59
System works well and voluntary Board as in Ireland undesirable	10251-3
Inspectors:	
Appointments:	
Average age	10115-7
Examination not needed, ...	10114, 10117
of School teachers, question, ...	10406-11
by Selection by the department	10051
Vacancies not advertised, but always large number of applicants on list	10042
Chief:	
Number and question as to delegation of authority, ...	10356-3, 10071-3, 10329
Salary	10363
Conferences	10108
Considerable amount of moving about but not until good grasp of district is obtained	10084, 10353
District, salary	10383
Duties	10090
Formal examination must be on record of school kept in log book	10000
Formal inspection but no fixed time in year for, ...	10043-5
Fell, number	10029
Gaelic spoken by number	10344-7
Incidental visits	10002
Individual examination of children has not ceased	10328
Individual results inspection, result of abolition question	10129-36
Junior:	
Number	10329
Salary	10363
Notice of visits	10014-7
Number of visits yearly	10333-4
Practically no diversity in standard adopted by	10360-2
Reports:	
Copied into Log Book	10391-2
Method of dealing with, 10029-3, 10157-45, 10369-75, 10406-7.	
Special report made by Chief inspector when teachers or managers appeal against	10024-0
Tone question	10027-9
Senior:	
even Chief inspectors, and has special district	10074-6
Staff	10077, 10329, 10331
Sub:	
Number	10329
Promotion to higher ranks not customary	10073
Recent men practically all University men	10079
do not Report immediately and directly	10118-9, 10303-6, 10406-7
Required to have experience in teaching	10380
Salary	10363
Two grades	10078
Syllabus or scheme of work submitted by teacher or manager must have signed approval of	10006-11
no system of formal training	10361
Wages for domestic subjects, number, ...	10329
Kindergarten highly appreciated and recognised method of infant training	10429-30, 10417-9

Robertson, J. L.—continued.

Managers:	
Appointments and dismissals, authority for, ...	10356-3
Office sometimes delegated	10303-71
Primary, intermediate and secondary courses, particulars, and co-ordination so that common examination is passed, ...	10375-84, 10002-41, 10016-59
School attendance, compulsory from, ...	1000
.. ..	10121-5
School buildings:	
Galleries disappearing	10427
Loans from Government, but no free grants	10254-5
Minimum-sized rooms, question, ...	10239-42, 10376-7
Local authority absolutely responsible for condition of building and equipment, 10007-9	
Plans have to go through hands of officials who is a trained architect	10230-2
Ventilation question	10427-8
School equipment, desks for every child, question	10415-25
Schools:	
Age limits	10032, 10236-35
Average attendance	10316-2
Babies under five, question	10229-31
En-languish, question, ...	10307-11
Children leaving before being able to secure employment, question, ...	10245-5
Every school has its own scheme of work and organisation, and managers, and teachers have large amount of discretion in, 10007-11, 10178-84, 10333-35	
Former system of grading, and objections to, ...	10032-37
Hands, no road for children down hills, 10203-9	
Imperial grant in aid of local exertion and particulars	10090-10060, 10294-6
Less efficient examined more frequently than others, and procedure, ...	10018-9, 10000-1
North and South East, large number of Catholics, and special arrangements made, ...	10206-7
Promotions of pupils entirely on responsibility of manager and teacher	10012-3
Roman Catholic:	
do not get anything from rates, ...	10145, 10105-8
Many in Highlands	10203
Often close to Protestant school, ...	10204
Single teacher, limit of numbers for	10193
Small Country:	
Convergence of children from long distances, question	10200-4
Distance between, question	10318-9
Salaries of teachers, question	10216-25
Largely taught by women, with assistant, ...	10186-92, 10188-202
Number of children, on rolls question, ...	10315-7
Sub:—	
Remuneration, amount	10329, 10325-7
in thinly-populated districts, arrangements, ...	10312-27
Voluntary, particulars, ...	10101-8, 10193-5
School Year, length, and uniform for financial purposes only, ...	10002-5, 10042-5
Teachers:	
Appointments and dismissals, authority for, and procedure	10356-07
Appointment as inspector, ...	10408-11
Certificates to teach higher and special subjects	10073-81
Civil rights, question, ...	10297-306
Dismissed, chance of re-employment, question, ...	10412-14
Dismissals for inefficiency, question, ...	10365-8
General certificate obtained at end of two years period in training colleges qualifying as full	10070-4
Junior student course for defending, particulars	10069-71
Maximum salary, question, ...	10378-39
Mode of dealing with old, having found difficulty in satisfying modern requirements, ...	10394-6

Robertson, J. L.—continued.

Part often taken by, in examinations, 19363	
Practical teaching during Junior student course, ...	16015-71
Representative, question of, ...	16284-93
Salaries:	
Question of rise, ...	16272-4
Scale in different localities varies very much, ...	16377
Training colleges and courses, particulars, 16972-5, 16385-90	
no Untrained, after next year, 16191, 16196-7	

Roscoe School:

Instance of personal want of courtesy of Inspector, <i>Grove</i> , ...	19243-9
Most marks, particulars, <i>Grove</i> , ...	19182-109

Rosegreen School:

Most marks, particulars, <i>Keegan</i> , 20118-28, 20134-71	
Principal teacher, resignation and withdrawal, particulars, <i>Keegan</i> , 20128-34, 20172-36, 20227-33	

Ross, Mr.:

Marking of Tycomnought School by, <i>Giff</i> , 17014, 17029-34, 17631	
Report on Belfast circuit, <i>Larson</i> , ...	16699
Roadside School, lowering of report following visit of Dr. Sturkie, <i>MacNeven</i> , ...	22144-38
Rules and Regulations, see under Board of National Education.	

S.

Salaries:

Assistant teachers should not be confined to lower grade, <i>Newsfield</i> , ...	21676
Burrell grant, allocation of, <i>Mahon</i> , ...	23361A-8
Board's attitude in regard to, <i>Mahon</i> , ...	23317-21
Comparison of grading with old system, <i>Ellis</i> , ...	17183-211
Contrast between old and new systems, <i>Newsfield</i> , ...	21416-9
Fee for extras, <i>Mahon</i> , ...	22709
Fixed, and completely independent of results of inspection desirable, <i>Robertson</i> , ...	18243-3
Grant for increasing, proposed by Mr. Burrell in 1900, <i>Mahon</i> , ...	23373-8
Higher initial, with smaller annual automatic increment scheme, <i>Carter</i> , ...	17474-9
Initial, too small, <i>Grove</i> , ...	19215
Instances of loss to teachers by change in system, <i>Todd</i> , ...	15126-38
Junior Assistant mistresses not paid living wage and consequence, <i>MacNeven</i> , ...	22336-7
Living wage early in life and top stationary desired, <i>MacNeven</i> , ...	22294-311
Maximum should be reached in shorter time, and question of suggested scheme, <i>Mahon</i> , ...	22853-943
Monthly payment advocated, <i>Newsfield</i> , 21676-83	
Much too low in proportion to importance of work, <i>Newsfield</i> , ...	21675
Question of taking test case in courts of law against Commissioners with regard to adjustment, <i>Jamison</i> , ...	18054
Report issued by Board in 1904 tending to incite comparison with Great Britain, and to make out that salaries were good considering size of schools, <i>Newsfield</i> , ...	21637
Teachers should be properly remunerated no matter what average of school is, <i>Cosler</i> , ...	14715-30
Teachers not satisfied with, <i>Newsfield</i> , 21735-60	
Unfair and inequitable fixing in 1900, <i>Nesb</i> , 20220, 20320-40	
see also Increment.	

Scholarships from National to Intermediate Schools, conference, <i>Ellis</i> , ...	16359
--	-------

Schools:

Intermediate, conference with representatives, re scholarships from National schools to, <i>Ellis</i> , ...	16359
---	-------

Schools—continued.

NATIONAL:	
Attendance, see School attendance.	
Belfast:	
Catholic, more than sufficient accommodation in, <i>Todd</i> , ...	15541-5
17 per cent. reduced, <i>Todd</i> , 16953-68, 14972	
19014, 16020-31, 16298-311, 16401-4, 16405-7; <i>Boyd</i> , 16715-49, 15766-8, 16034;	
<i>Larson</i> , 16983-5, 16092-6	
Lack of accommodation, and school attendance	
Act therefore of very little use, <i>Todd</i> , 16597-9	
Number of children who cannot find school places, <i>Todd</i> , ...	16532-45
111 out of 404, protected, <i>Larson</i> , ...	16386
Ownership of teachers, question, <i>Todd</i> , 16384-81	
Plan suggested by teachers for re-examination of, <i>Todd</i> , ...	15239-44, 15563-72
Re-inspection:	
no Redress given to teachers in cases where mark was raised on, <i>Boyd</i> , ...	15940-3, 15948-9
Looked upon as a farce by teachers, <i>Todd</i> , ...	15556-68
Re-inspection of White schools expected as result of memorial and agitation, <i>Larson</i> , ...	16687-94
Reply to statement of chief inspectors that teachers would not select number of for examination, <i>Todd</i> , ...	16253
Rules existing to have whole of 111 schools investigated, question, <i>Boyd</i> , ...	15940-7
Statement by Mr. Dewar that there was no effective teaching in, <i>Todd</i> , 16009-12, 16261-7, 15094-6, 16274; <i>Boyd</i> , 15769-72	
See also particular names of Schools.	
Buildings, see School Buildings.	
Children, should get due notice of proposed annual examination, <i>Cosler</i> , 14483-91, 14705-87.	
Cleansing:	
Opinion of Father Pembroke, <i>Keegan</i> , 20117, 20234	
Re-inspection, but teachers refused any redress or recognition of wrong done, <i>Newsfield</i> , 21797-9	
Thirteen schools re-examined of which six only were included in memorial, <i>Keegan</i> , 20692, 20295-6; <i>Newsfield</i> , 21441-4.	
Mr. Welpy's mark raised by Mr. Hynes in 4 out of 6, <i>Keegan</i> , ...	20207-8
Conveyances for children, risk of accident, <i>Cosler</i> , ...	14749-32, 14709-60
Equipment, see School Equipment.	
Grant for Heating and Cleansing:	
Conditions, <i>Ellis</i> , ...	16920
Investigation part of work of Irish National Teachers' Association, <i>Ellis</i> , ...	16908-9
Obligations carried out by parochial authorities in some cases but not in others, <i>Ellis</i> , ...	16919-28
Part of money directed to be applied to outside of house, <i>Ellis</i> , ...	17123
Work usually done by teachers in Belfast schools, in county schools by children themselves under teacher's eye, <i>Ellis</i> , 16917-8	
Inspectors, see that title.	
Leaving certificates for fifth standard suggested and for teachers to be partly awarded in commendation, <i>Cosler</i> , ...	14329-31, 14837-86
Organisation, see School Organisation.	
Programme, see School Programme.	
Promotions of children:	
should take place as a rule after examination, but teacher's judgment should be supreme, and should be free to promote child at any time of year, <i>Mahon</i> , ...	22834-6
Proportion kept in same standard over two years, <i>Todd</i> , ...	15427-8
should not be restricted to beginning of school year, <i>Robertson</i> , ...	16216-2
should not be kept down another year in same class, <i>Robertson</i> , ...	16213-5
Property of teachers, question, <i>Boyd</i> , ...	15761-5
no Real co-ordination with secondary schools, and suggestion, <i>Newsfield</i> , ...	21771-88

Schools—continued.

- Rule 121 (d), *Caulter*, 14746-52; *Elliot*, 16973, 17979-86; *O'Callaghan*, 20810-39; *Manxfield*, 21491-5, 21513-7; *MacDonagh*, 21581-90; *Mahan*, 22715-21, 21261-96
- Small, multiplication, Commissioners responsible for, *Manxfield*, ... 21012
- Teachers, see that title.
- Teacher should be allowed to exclude backward or irregular pupils from examination, *Smyth*, 17803-8 17837-40; *Manxfield*, 21638; *Mahan*, 22960
- Time-table, see that title.
- Vacations, rules and effect, *Elliot*, 16976, 17000-9
- Year, see School year.
- Scotland, see under Scotland.
- Secondary, no real co-ordination with primary schools, and suggestion, *Manxfield*, 21771-83
- see also place names.

School Attendance :

- Bad and intermittent, and Compulsory Act not enforced, *Caulter*, 14592-5, 14758-9, 14743-5
- Marking of pupils, particulars, *Elliot*, 16987, 17105-19
- School Attendance Act in force in Belfast, but of little use owing to lack of accommodation, *Todd*, 15397-9

School Buildings :

- Effect on merit marks by, *Todd*, 15038-124, 15305-9, 15350-2; *Larmer*, 16668-83; 16714, 16727, 16741, 16742, 16769-85, 16822-6, 16810-18; *Ramsay*, 20978-90; *Manxfield*, 21538-52; *Mahan*, 23526-8
- Funds raised by teachers for upkeep, *Todd*, 15471-81, 15546-50
- Report of Board that no teacher was to be recommended for promotion whose school was not above reproach in point of sanitation, *Manxfield*, 21538-52

School Equipment :

- no case known of teachers providing out of their own pockets, *Owen*, ... 14620-1
- Marks lowered by and proof, *Todd*, 15088-124, 15305-9, 15350-2
- Some provision should be made for supplying free books, stationery, &c., *Ramsay*, ... 21058

School Organisation :

- Inspectors should not unduly interfere, *Smyth*, 17809; *Anderson*, 18160.
- Inspector should not recommend change of, without giving practical illustration of how to carry it out, *Mahan*, ... 23942-51

School Programme :

- Agriculture, teaching in country schools advocated, *Ramsay*, ... 21035
- Anonymous document regarding grouping, chief of inspection required for endorsing, *Manxfield*, 21585-92
- ANTHROPOLOGY :
Class examination in, advocated, *Todd*, 15143-5
- not so correct under present system, *Smyth*, 17858-9
- Mechanical part should be thoroughly mastered, *Anderson*, ... 18198-9, 18254-55
- Bilingual, injustice to some teachers, *Manxfield*, 21585-92
- COOKERY, LAUNDRYWORK, AND DOMESTIC SCIENCE :
might be left to higher elementary schools or technical schools, *Carter*, ... 17597-80
- Methods adopted by Commissioners to secure introduction, *Carter*, ... 17533-6
- Teachers threatened with denial of increment unless they introduced, *Mahan*, 23377-83
- Constant shifting and changing, *Manxfield*, 21592-3
- Drawing, instances of subjects in some cases requiring greater prominence than others, *Todd*, 15166-72
- Drawn up by Teachers' Organisation in 1903, and presented to Dr. Starkie for consideration, but rejected with exception of solitary subject, *Mahan*, ... 23359
- Effects of new system on Ormeau Road School, Belfast, *Carter*, ... 17406-21, 17426-8

School Programme—continued.

- should be more liberality in view of possibilities in certain districts, *Owen*, ... 14870-3
- English, teaching has not improved sufficiently, *Carter*, ... 17528-4, 17591-3
- Essential subjects should be taught in every school with liberty to teachers and managers to take other subjects suited to requirements of locality, *Todd*, ... 15248-54
- Evils of Results system practically re-introduced under, *Carter*, ... 17597-9
- Fees for teaching extra subjects except Irish abolished in 1903, *Elliot*, ... 16973, 17087-95
- Geography : improvement could be made in teaching, *Cahill*, ... 17700
- HOME LESSONS :
Encouraged at one time by Board but prohibited some years ago, *Smyth*, ... 17882-8
- Importance attached to, *Reed*, ... 15895-7
- Hurried training of teachers in new subjects, *Mahan*, ... 23226-38
- Irish, appeal for re-examination of Tycomnight School, particulars, *Cahill*, ... 17670-97
- Mathematics, fees abolished, but afterwards restored, *Elliot*, ... 16973-5
- Modified, submission by teachers, question, *Carter*, 17524-31
- Nature study, substituted for science in a good many schools, *Todd*, ... 15437
- Overcrowded, *O'Flanagan*, 20928-30, 20938-32; *Manxfield*, 21583; *Mahan*, 22722, 23270-5
- Provision re introduction of modified, a dead letter, and reasons, *Todd*, 15155-66; *Manxfield*, 21583-4
- READING :
Books, new rule, *Elliot*, ... 16992, 17124-5
- Class examination in, advocated, *Todd*, 15143-5
- Comparison with Results system, *Todd*, 15150-4
- of infants, teachers have to print lessons on blackboard, *Elliot*, ... 17567-9
- must be Mechanical at beginning, *Anderson*, 18311-3
- not taught as it should be, *Cahill*, 17702-3
- Refusal of Resident Commissioner to receive despatch from Teachers' Organisation, *Mahan*, 23219-24
- SCIENCE :
Course as at present practically useless for schools in Belfast, *Todd*, ... 15133-6
- might be left to higher elementary schools or technical schools, *Carter*, ... 17597-80
- Nature study substituted for, in a good many schools, *Todd*, ... 15437
- Objection to, that it takes up time that might be more usefully employed, *Todd*, 15239-47
- Possibility of teaching, effectively, question, *Todd*, ... 15418-20
- Spelling, class examination in, advocated, *Todd*, 15143-5
- Subjects which might be left to higher elementary schools or to technical schools, *Carter*, 17597-80
- Suitable to various schools should be arranged, *Ramsay*, ... 21058
- Too wide, *Smyth*, ... 17580-2
- WRITING AND COMPOSITIONS :
Class examination in, advocated, *Todd*, 15143-5
- Comparison with Results system, *Todd*, 15131-3
- School Year :
Forma for, issued by inspectors, particulars, *Elliot*, ... 17149-57
- Separate, for each school, advocated, as affecting examination, *Todd*, 15318-21, 15335, 15387, *Reed*, 15849-52, 15909-1; *Elliot*, 17048-52, 17597-9; *Anderson*, 18242; *Owen*, 18699, 18660; *Owen*, 19394-5; *O'Flanagan*, 20902-3; *MacDonagh*, 22320-32; *Mahan*, 22332
- Three additional school years as well as uniform, *Elliot*, ... 16973-3
- Uniform :
Established by circular, *Elliot*, ... 16912
- Injustice in marking arising from examination taking place early in, *Todd*, 15125-6, 15130-43, 15173-7, 15417-5.
- Objections to, *Elliot*, ... 16973
- Rule cause of trouble to teachers, *Elliot*, 16974
- s. Separate for each school, question, *Caulter*, 17434-4, 14742, 14759-7
- Science, see under School Programme.

Scotland :

- Bursaries, particulars, Robertson, .. 16385-6
Cost of inspection and office administration,
Mansfield, .. 21406-11
Education. Keen local interest, Robertson, 16111

STATIONERY DEPARTMENT :

- Accessible to all complaints on part of managers
and teachers or parents, Robertson, 16309-79
Building plans have to go through hands of
official who is a trained architect, Robertson,
16236-8
Change in regulations, procedure, Robertson,
16108-77
Circulars issued to inspectors, Robertson, 16161-7
Method of dealing with reports, Robertson, 16137-
45, 16360-73, 16400-1
Official staff, visits to schools, question, Robertson,
16146-50
Permanent Secretary. Comparison of position
with Resident Commissioner in Ireland,
question, Robertson, .. 16243-7
Proportion of work done in London and in
Edinburgh, question, Robertson, 16248-50
Reprimands of teachers, question of, Robertson,
16284-93
System works well and voluntary Board as in
Ireland undesirable, Robertson, 16251-3
Individual results inspection, gains and losses
resulting from abolition, question, Robertson,
16120-30

INSPECTORS :

- Appointments :
Average age, Robertson, .. 16115-7
Examination not needed, Robertson, 16114,
16117
of School teachers, question, Robertson,
16408-11
by Selection by the department, Robertson,
15961
Vacancies not advertised, but always large
number of applicants on list, Robertson,
15982
Chief :
Number, Robertson, .. 15971-3, 16329
Number of inspectors under, and question as
to delegation of authority, Robertson,
16354-9
Salary, Robertson, .. 15963
Special report made by, when teachers or
managers appeal against reports, Robertson,
16024-6
Conferences, Robertson, .. 16168
Considerable amount of moving about, but not
until good grasp of district is obtained,
Robertson, 15964, 16353
District, Salary, Robertson, .. 15983
Duties, Robertson, .. 16090
Examinations, part often taken in, by teacher,
Robertson, .. 16363
Formal examination must be on record of school
kept in log book, Robertson, .. 16006
Formal inspection, but no fixed time as year
for, Robertson, .. 16093-5
Full number, Robertson, .. 16329
Gaelic spoken by number, Robertson, 15964-7
Incidental visits, Robertson, .. 16002
Individual examination of children has not
ceased, Robertson, .. 16420

Junior :

- Number, Robertson, .. 16320
Salary, Robertson, .. 15963
Notice of visits, question, Robertson, 16014-7
Number of visits yearly, Robertson, 16333-4
Practically no diversity in standard adopted by,
Robertson, .. 16360-2

Reports :

- Copied into Log Book, Robertson, 16391-2
no definite graduation of marks, Robertson,
16020-3
method of dealing with, in office, Robertson,
16137-45, 16303-75, 16400-7
Special report made by Chief Inspector when
teachers or managers appeal against,
Robertson, .. 16024-6
Tone question, Robertson, .. 16027-9
Superior over Chief Inspectors, and has special
district, Robertson, .. 15974-6

Scotland—continued.

- see also L.L.D., Robertson, J. L., 16067-16430
Staff, Robertson, .. 15977, 16329, 16331
Sub, first and second class, Number, Robertson,
16329

- Promotion to higher ranks not confined,
Robertson, .. 15978
Recent men practically all University men,
Robertson, .. 15979
do not Report immediately and directly,
Robertson, 16118-9, 16369-9, 16400-7
Required to have experience in teaching,
Robertson, .. 15969
Salary, Robertson, .. 15983
Two grades, Robertson, .. 15974
Syllabus or scheme of work submitted by
teacher or manager must have signed
approval of, Robertson, 16008-11
no system of formal training, Robertson, 15961
Women, for domestic subjects, number,
Robertson, .. 16320
Kindergarten highly appreciated and recognised
method of infant training, Robertson, 16417-9,
16428-30

MANAGERS :

- Appointment and dismissal, authority for,
Robertson, 16256-6
Office sometimes delegated, Robertson, 16268-71
Primary, intermediate, and secondary courses,
and co-ordination so that common examination
is passed, particulars, Robertson, 16032-41,
16046-56, 16378-84.

SCHOOLS :

- School attendance, compulsory from 1895,
Robertson, .. 16121-3
School boards, reference, Robertson, 16102-10
SCHOOL BUILDINGS :
Galleries disappearing, Robertson, .. 16427
Loans from Government but no free grants,
Robertson, .. 16356-5
Minimum floor space for each pupil, question,
Robertson, .. 16370-7
Minimum-sized rooms, question, Robertson,
16336-42
Plans have to go through hands of official who
is a trained architect, Robertson, 16236-8
Ventilation question, Robertson, .. 16427-9
School equipment, desks for every child, question,
Robertson, .. 16415-25
School Log Book, reports copied into, Robertson,
16391-2

SCHOOL YEAR :

- from Re-opening of schools after autumn vacation
but quite variable for inspection purposes,
Robertson, .. 16035-8, 16043-5
Uniform for financial purposes only, Robertson,
16004, 16042
Age limits, Robertson, .. 16032, 16320-35
Average attendance, Robertson, .. 16330-2
Babies under 5, question, Robertson, 16320-31
Bi-lingualism question, Robertson, 16367-11
Children leaving before being able to secure
employment, question, Robertson, 16239-5
Every school has its own scheme of work, and
managers and teachers have large amount of
discretion in, and in organisation, Robertson,
16007-11, 16178-84, 16325-32
Formal system of grading, and objections to,
Robertson, .. 16032-97
Harris, no road for children down hills, Robertson,
16208-9
Imperial grant in aid of local erection and
particulars, Robertson, 16000-16000, 16294-6
Less efficient, examined more frequently than
others, and procedure, Robertson, 16016-8,
16030-1
Local authority absolutely responsible for con-
dition of building and equipment, Robertson,
16007-9
North and South Div. large number of
Catholics, and special arrangement made,
Robertson, .. 16206-7
Promotions of pupils entirely on responsibility of
manager and teacher, Robertson, 16012-3
Roman Catholic :
do not get anything from rates, Robertson,
16103, 16106-8
Often close to Protestant school, Robertson,
16206

Stewart, R. J., unfairness of dismissal and mode of trial adopted, particulars, *Elliot*, . . . 17267-325
 Stokes, Mr., marking of *Howard Boys' School*, *O'Donnell*, . . . 19813-6

Strong, Mr. :

Marking by
Anghrim School, MacSwiney, . . . 21074
Ballymacarett Road School, Belfast, Todd, . . . 15251
Blessington Boys' School, Leathers, . . . 21075
Glenashly School, MacSwiney, . . . 22136
Sullivan, P. B., dismissal, case of, Mahon, . . . 22249, 22532
 SWEENEY, MISS MARY A., Principal of *Hardyke National School, County Tipperary*, 19578-19758
 Recused as teacher, . . . 19579-87, 19639-700
Sydenham School, see under Belfast.

T.

Tankerstown School, merit mark, particulars, Rogers, . . . 20234

Teachers :

Administration has been one long period of civil war between Dr. Starke and, and statement, *re Mahon*, . . . 23183-30
 Administration responsible for inspectorate grievances, *Mahon*, . . . 22511-34
 should be afforded opportunity of examining class on lines on which subject has been taught, in presence of inspector, *Anderson*, . . . 15197
 Afraid of being punished on account of having appealed, *Anderson*, . . . 15227
 Agreement terms for, discussed by Dr. Starke at deposition in 1907, *Mahon*, . . . 22339-46
 should be allowed considerable freedom in school organisation, *Anderson*, . . . 15129
 Appeals, see that title
 may be Appointed additional councillors, *Elliot*, . . . 19881
 Appointment of inspectors exclusively from ranks of, advocated, *Bayd*, . . . 15886-90

AGENTS :

had better chance of promotion to principal under old rules, *Mahon*, . . . 23013-32
 Injustice of holding principal responsible for work, when he has no voice in appointment, *Owen*, . . . 19230-3
 Marks entitling to promotion in exceptional circumstances an official second as late as *Dublin Congress, Easter, 1913, Mahon*, . . . 22526-464
 Merit mark of school dragged down by, *Mansfield*, . . . 21296-1
 Principals have no control over, *Mansfield*, . . . 21295-57, 21291, 21543-6
 Slow promotion to second grade, *Mansfield*, . . . 21552-5
 Attack on, by Dr. Starke in address before *British Association, Mahon*, . . . 22553-7
 Atmosphere of intense dissatisfaction all over country, and particularly in North, and cases, *Elliot*, . . . 17370-88
 to Avoid fairs, markets and meetings : to abstain from controversy ; and to do nothing in or out of school which might have tendency to confine to any denomination of children, *Elliot*, . . . 16976, 16981

BOARD :

Chief Inspector's views as to efficiency, *Todd*, . . . 15274-7
 had Considered necessity for making representations for some time, *Todd*, . . . 14949-50
 Description of *Belfast* as a storm centre, question of, *Bayd*, . . . 14891-3
 no Fall in efficiency corresponding to lowering of marks, *Todd*, . . . 15253
 Failure of, to appeal, question of, *Bayd*, 18867-70
 Great number more reductions than statistics showed, known of where teachers refused to sign, because they thought they would be punished, *Todd*, . . . 14967-8
 Laziness of marking prior to 1896, because programme was new to, question of, 15032-7

Teachers—continued.

Belfast—continued.

Reason for not accepting Dr. Starke's offer, *Todd*, . . . 15408-9
 no Address given to teachers in cases where mark was raised in re-inspection, *Bayd*, 15040-5
 Regarded as concern of profession some years ago, and due to fact that owing to greater attractiveness of salaries, used to draw men from all parts of Ireland, *Todd*, . . . 15073-87
 Relations with inspectors deplorably bad, *Bayd*, . . . 15071
 Reply to statement of chief inspectors that teachers would not select number of schools for examination, *Todd*, . . . 15235
 Striving to meet requirements of new programme, *Learner*, . . . 16330-2
 Board has very little sympathy with, *Mansfield*, 21337-43

CANTONMENTS :

Better and larger supply formerly, and reason, *Owen*, . . . 19280-1, 19293
 Considerable deterioration in qualifications, *Mansfield*, . . . 21692-712
 Entrance examinations should be stiff, *Rensay*, . . . 21034
 Fees for Latin and French should be paid so as to give schools that do not take up Irish an opportunity to qualify as, *Mansfield*, 21713-6
 Large number unable to pass entrance examination to training colleges, *Owen*, . . . 19284-9
 Number of, in training, *Mansfield*, . . . 21700-2
 Tendency to substitute against joining service by little consideration shown by inspectors to teachers, *Owen*, . . . 19283-9

CERTIFICATES :

of *Killmore Congress*, decision to stand by, *Formis I. & II.*, of teachers' agreements, *Mahon*, . . . 23539-80
 Maynooth resolutions accepted as sufficient guarantee, *Elliot*, . . . 16891
 Certificates should not be given without teacher being given opportunity of defending himself and being allowed to see report and charges laid against him, so that he might make defence, and in any case should be appeal, *Mahon*, 23604-13
 Charges against :
 Anonymous, investigated by Board, *Mansfield*, 21630-6 ; *Mahon*, 22519-25, 22672-80
 Case of, by inspector with discount and ceases of, by Board, and manner of investigation of matter, *Rensay*, . . . 21624-9
 Any kind of evidence taken, *MacSwiney*, . . . 22263-75

Cross-examination of witnesses by teacher not allowed, *MacSwiney*, 22224, 22279 ; *Mahon*, 22584-92

Investigations conducted in such a way as to give no confidence in results, *MacSwiney*, . . . 22263-87

Legal advice permitted, *Elliot*, . . . 17336-40

should be Represented by solicitor, *MacSwiney*, . . . 22224, 22231

when Children are not answering inspector well, should be called upon to examine class themselves, *Anderson*, . . . 16248-50

Circulars as a rule not seen by, *Bayd*, . . . 17389-90

CIVIL RIGHTS :

should be Allowed same rights as subjects of King in every other part of *British Dominions, Mahon*, . . . 22724-54
 Commission of full civil liberty claimed, *Rensay*, . . . 21065

Rights and liberties as citizens and members of the community unduly restricted, *Mahon*, . . . 20674-726

Statement by Dr. Starke that managers were opposed to, and that Mr. Birrell had question more harsh than good, contradicted, *Mahon*, . . . 22374, 22370-4

CLEANING AND UPKEEP OF SCHOOLS :

no Case known of provision of school equipment out of their own pockets, *Owen*, . . . 14920-1

Investigation part of work of *Irish National Teachers' Association, Elliot*, . . . 16996-9

Upkeep of schools, question of, *Todd*, 15471-81, 15566-50 ; *Mahon*, . . . 22665-71

Work mostly done by teachers in *Belfast, Elliot*, . . . 16917-8

Teachers—continued.

CUMMEL:

- Criticism by Mr. Hynes for holding back complaints so long, and for acting in concert, *Keegan*, .. 20089
 Entitled to redress, and question of, *Keegan*, .. 18574-8
 Equal at least to those of other circuits, *Manifold*, .. 21363-8
 Happy relations between, and inspectors till advent of Mr. Welply, *Keegan*, .. 20088
 Letter to Board, suggesting transfer of Mr. Welply to vacancy in another circuit, *Manifold*, .. 21362-63
 Organisms' classes well attended, *Keegan*, .. 20092-4
 Pecuniary obligations for equipment and upkeep of schools, *Keegan*, .. 20213-26
 Privileged letter to Board stating that in opinion of Mr. Welply was qualifying for chief inspectorship, and fairness on part of Mr. Hynes, and particulars, *Manifold*, .. 21430-41
 Restoration of merit marks given under previous inspectors, and making good of monetary loss only way of redressing wrongs, *Keegan*, .. 20216-2
 Having serious grievances, would not sign memorial, *Keegan*, .. 20090-91, 21087-96
 not a single teacher who signed memorial, or who sent in statements of complaint, filed by board, and parties, *Manifold*, .. 21445-69
 Statement that they were not prepared to give Mr. Welply a fair trial, related, *Manifold*, .. 21441
 Statement that managers did not interfere, inaccurate, *Manifold*, .. 21439
 Closure of Board to, at date of introduction of changes, *Manifold*, .. 20340-1
 Comparison of relations of old inspectors and new to, *Manifold*, .. 22517-34
 Complete access to Board at any time, *Deane*, .. 21403-5
 Commissioners was without any practical help from Board, *Manifold*, .. 21080-128
 Conditions of service should be known, *Boyd*, .. 18961-3
 Conference re scholarships from National to Intermediate schools, *Elliot*, .. 10869
 Conferences held amongst themselves, *Anderson*, .. 18320-3
- CONFERENCE WITH INSPECTORS:
 Advocated, *Corier*, 17498-508; *Smyth*, 17798-801
Anderson, 18197, 18267-8; *Mahon*, 21831-2
 Suggested made, *Anderson*, .. 18211-9
 would be valueless under present system, *Anderson*, .. 18397-19
 not Controlled by Board on introduction of new scheme, *Manifold*, .. 21578-81
 Correspondence with Board not admitted unless touched by manager, *Manifold*, .. 21629-39
 Criticised by inspectors for want of preparation for *Keegan*, *Todd*, .. 18223-7
- DISMISSAL:
 In absence of sworn inquiry court of appeal should be formed for investigating grave charges involving, *Mahon*, .. 22842-69
 without Appeal, grievance removed by Irish National Teachers' Association, *Elliot*, .. 16886-93
 Applications made personally to Commissioners in cases where teacher considers he is unfairly dealt with, *Deane*, .. 22442, 22463-8
 Case of Mr. Stuart, and mode of trial adopted, particulars, *Elliot*, .. 17267-324
 Cases, *MacSweeney*, .. 22079-222
 Cases placed upon Agenda of Board, *Deane*, 22441
 Change in rules does not give complete defence and reason, and case, *Elliot*, .. 16963-7
 Death of inefficiency circular proved greater calamity than its birth, *Mahon*, 22169-77
 Denounced by Dr. Twiss, *Mahon*, .. 22823
 Deputation to Chief Secretary, *Mahon*, 22849-53
 Discussion with Board, question of, *Deane*, 22442-32
 False returns given by Board to Parliament, *Manifold*, .. 21468-9, 21575-6
 Increase, question as to districts, *MacSweeney*, 22351
 Increase in number, and lack of safeguards to teachers, *Mahon*, .. 22523-35

Teachers—continued.

for Inefficiency:

- to Appeals granted, *MacSweeney*, 22230-4
 disadvantages of teachers charged with, and proposal, *Mahon*, .. 23373-420
 Increase under new system, *Elliot*, .. 17213-4
- Investigation:
 by some Authority independent of inspectors in charge of district desired, *MacSweeney*, 22049-74
 no Report sent down by investigating officer, *MacSweeney*, .. 22227
 Principals sometimes obtain employment as assistants, *MacSweeney*, .. 22333-5
 Rule 96, new and old, *Mahon*, 22556, 22559-66, 22562-71
 Sworn inquiry in grave charges involving, question of, *Mahon*, .. 22541-66
 no systematic procedure to safeguard teacher in case of threatened, *Mahon*, .. 22349
 Duplicates of all school documents sent to manager should be supplied to, *Keegan*, .. 21066
 Encouragement should be given to study Irish, *Manifold*, .. 21717-20
 Encouragement and reward should be given to increased scholarship, *Keegan*, .. 21053
 Retained relations with Commissioners, several cases, *Keegan*, .. 20250
 Extracts only of reports sent to, *Todd*, 15442-7
 Fads of inspectors cultivated by, in order to get increment, at expense of sound education, *Keegan*, .. 19245-7
 Fees for extra subjects, except Irish, abolished, *Elliot*, 18073, 17087-65
 Forbidden to keep publichouses, or houses for sale of spirituous liquors, or to live in any such house, *Elliot*, .. 10970-81
 should be Free, with concurrence of managers, to adopt any Time Table arrangements they please, *Keegan*, .. 21068
 Freedom to discuss political matters would be advantage, *Manifold*, .. 21684-9
 Friendly relations with former Resident Commissioners, *Mahon*, .. 22129-32
 Full reports should be furnished to, *Keegan*, 21609; *Manifold*, 21644-53; *Mahon*, 22830-42
 Grades, see that title
 Grievances and discontent against individual, inspector rather than system, *Corier*, 18335-42
 14753-4, 14761-4
 Hurred training in new subjects in programme, *Mahon*, .. 21229-34
 Husband or wife of owner or scamp of public house not recognised as, *Elliot*, .. 16881-6
 in ignorance of conditions under which they work, *Manifold*, .. 21599-400
 Implication of chief inspectors that dissatisfaction is confined to one or two circuits or agencies contradicted, *Manifold*, .. 21721-34
 should be incentive to, to improve qualifications for teaching in way of personal study apart from school, *Keegan*, .. 14032-4
 Increments, see that title
 Insistence of inspectors alleged, appeal refused, *MacSweeney*, .. 22230-3
 Inspectors should in main be given to, *Manifold*, 21639; *Mahon*, 22062-3
 Inspectors should consult with, previous to writing in Observation Book, *Keegan*, .. 14844-5
 Inspectors inclined to exasperate should not be promoted to higher ranks, *Manifold*, .. 21644
 Inspectors should not interfere with methods when working satisfactorily, *Boyd*, .. 15919-27
 in Irish-speaking districts, injustice of bilingual programme, *Manifold*, .. 21523-36
- JUNIOR ASSISTANT-MASTERS:
 Case of vested rights of teachers being ignored in making rules, *Keegan*, .. 20041-61
 not Paid Eving wage and consequences, *MacSweeney*, .. 22336-7
 Rule introduced that they should go when average rose above 50, and injustice and question of employment of, *Manifold*, 21590-24
 Libel on, by Dr. Clarke at Royal University Commission, *Mahon*, .. 23242-7
 Liberty of, rules, *Elliot*, 16276-80, 17160-164

Teachers—continued.

MAYAGRE'S CONFIDENTIAL REPORT:
Abolished in 1911, and particulars, Elliot, 17120-2, 19285-82
Objectionable, Mahon, 23351-2

MATERNITY RULE:

Board should provide substitutes, Mahon, 23475-82
Copy of report on deputation to be forwarded, Elliot, 19287-8
Deputation from I. N. T. A. received nominally by whole Board, Elliot, 19046-51
Teachers deprived of month's leave of absence allowed by Treasury in case of illness, Mahon, 23469-75
Vested rights swept away, and teachers heavily penalised, Elliot, 19273, 17072-8; Mansfield, 21498-500
Virtually withdrawn in case of existing teachers, Elliot, 16973
Merit marks, see that title
Modified programmes not submitted by, and reasons, Mansfield, 21583-4
Monitors done without by some, as trouble considered too great for any advantage derived from services, Elliot, 16973
New clause in regulations since Local Government Act came into operation, Elliot, 16981
New subjects in programme incapable of being dealt with successfully by, Mahon, 23226-8
Notes of Lessons, had forced on teachers and in most cases injurious rather than helpful, Elliot, 16992, 17120-133
Notice should be given to, of annual inspection, Coulter, 14648-51, 14765-87; Owens, 16880-4, 14622-5; Todd, 15314-22, 15419, 15687; Boyd, 15875, 15901; Cross, 16841; O'Connell, 20620-3, 20604-5; Kenney, 21042-57; Mansfield, 21056, 21638; MacSweeney, 23317-8
Notice should be given to, of rules and changes, Mansfield, 21426-2
Number of changes, omissions, and number of new rules introduced harassing to, Elliot, 16992
Ownership of schools, question, Boyd, 15761-5
Parliamentary Secretary to, explanation, Mahon, 23338-40

PENALTIES:

For inefficiency and falsification, circular issued under regime and by authority of Dr. Starke, Mahon, 23168-62
Scale always existed, but publication of circular in newspapers not calculated to raise teachers in public esteem, Mahon, 23168-8
Permitted to act as presiding officers and polling clerks at elections, Elliot, 16981
not Permitted to carry on, or engage in, any business or occupation that will impair their usefulness as teachers, Elliot, 16976
should be Permitted to see all "Instructions to Inspectors," Kenney, 21058
Portion of examination at annual inspection might be done by, Mansfield, 21658
should have Power to withdraw abnormally dull or very irregular children from annual inspection, Mansfield, 21658
Practically no inducement given to young, to study, Owens, 16210-3, 16273, 19281-2
Practice re examination of pupils in course of year, Smyth, 17663-76

PRINCIPAL:

no Control over assistants, Mansfield, 21266-87, 21291, 21943-5
Injustice of holding responsible for work of assistants when he has no voice in appointment, Owens, 19280-5
have to Print on black-board lessons for infants, Elliot, 17367-9
Prohibited from contesting any constituency, Elliot, 16931-5
Promotion, see that title
Recruitment of inspectors from, question, Todd, 15182-207
Relations with Board, Mahon, 23396-11
Representatives should at all times have free and friendly access to Board, Mahon, 23832
Reprimands. Reckless issue, suggestion, Cross, 18647-8

Teachers—continued.

Required to devote extra time to instruction of monitors, for which they receive no pecuniary reward, Elliot, 16973
Rule, 127 (b)—Coulter, 14746-82; Elliot, 16973, 17079-86; O'Connell, 20610-39; Mansfield, 21491-5, 21613-7; MacSweeney, 23381-90; Mahon, 23716-21, 23201-90
Rural schools, effect of grading system, Mahon, 22716-21

should be Rewarded if school were particularly efficient and up to high standard, Coulter, 14703-4
Salaries, see that title
where Schools have declined in usefulness and efficiency, or who have conducted themselves improperly, old and new rules, Elliot, 17223-6
Scotland, see under Scotland

Dr. Starke tried to show in 20 paragraphs in 1903, that they had no Ground for grievance as compared with English Teachers, Mahon, 23376
Statement that reports are received by, within one month of date of inspection, controverted, Boyd, 15729-69

Statement that teachers would not suffer a penny from introduction of new system, but saving of £50,000 per annum through, question of, Mansfield, 21587-63

Status entirely changed by new system without any previous notice being given, Elliot, 16973

Suggestions in Observation Book of very little use to, Todd, 15429-31; Anderson, 18304-4; Greg, 18493-5

of Superior qualifications long and efficient service should be promoted from smaller to larger schools, Mansfield, 21676

would Tend to prevent misunderstanding if no entry were made in Observation Book, without inspector having talk with, on proposed observation, Anderson, 18261-6

Tone circular unfavourable to, Elliot, 16992

Tone and manner of inspectors towards, Coulter, 14656-8, 14673-82, 14792-4; See E. D. Owens, 14341-4, 14396-903; Todd, 15037-66, 15111-3, 15178-81; Larsson, 16792-3; Carter, 17432-6, 17506; Gregg, 18279-82; E. Owens, 18632-4; Owens, 19293-9; Curry, 19518-25; O'Connell, 20682-73; Kenney, 21018-23; Mansfield, 21444

Typing:
Blundering regarding, Mansfield, 21618-28
Radical change needed, Kenney, 21058

Transition:

Memorial, in 1903, but still agitating for redress, Mahon, 23226
Memorial, and another attempt to gain redress, Mahon, 23343

Promises regarding salaries and promotion under old rules of Board completely ignored when introducing new system of 1900, and case, Mansfield, 21378-96

should be Trusted more, Mansfield, 21688

Undergrudge, number, and injustice, &c., Jamieson, 17963-18038; Mahon, 22707-14, 22012-5, 23180-215

Unfairly treated by Board under new system, Elliot, 17042-7

Unrest and dissatisfaction general, Owens, 14321-3, 14833-7; Owens, 19286-9; O'Connell, 20671-84; Owens, 18659-5; O'Flanagan, 20671-3; Kenney, 21004-8; Mansfield, 21794

Untrained, increment to at least top of third grade claimed, Mahon, 23066-78

Vested rights, Board had no respect, Mansfield, 21498-516

Views entertained by, as to effect of abolition of Results system, Kenney, 21668

Wicklow, agitation re Rule 127 (b) and managers memorialised, MacSweeney, 23881-90

Willing and anxious to co-operate with Dr. Starke in 1900, Mahon, 23178-80

see also particular names, and under names of schools

Temple School:

Merit marks, particulars, O'Grady, 19891-950, 19909-85

Principal teacher, history of public house being kept by wife, O'Grady, 19951-63

Referred to, in memorial, Kenney, 20199

Templemoy School, merit mark, particulars, Nash,
19243-9
Thompson, Henry L., case instanced as showing
teacher was taken at disadvantage at time of in-
spection, and that due allowance was not made
for it, Ramsey, 19092-4
Tibbs, Mr., marking of Blessington Boys' School,
Lansdown, 21975

Time-table :

should be more elasticity in view of, possibilities
in certain districts, Orove, 14875-8
One inspector contradicts another and changes,
Conifer, 14882, 14738-31
Specimen, for every class of school, should be issued
from Education Office, and discussed at con-
ferences, Makos, 20231-2
Surprise visits should not be outside hours
mentioned in, Mansfield, 21654
Teachers, with concurrence of managers, should be
free to adopt any arrangements they please,
Ramsey, 21003

Tipperary, see General circuit.

Tipperary County Executive Committee, criticism as
fomenters of strife, extremists, alarmists, &c., and
injustice and unwisdom of Board in rejecting ad-
vice and overture for peace, Reegan, 20117-8

TODD, CHARLES H., Principal of Ballymacarrett
Road National School, Belfast : 14935-15709
Accused of altering Observation Book, 15645-50
Highest fixed income of any teacher in Ireland,
and loss under new system 15126-33

APPRAISAL :

not conducted on right time, 15370-3
Inquiry should be open, 15374-91
Teacher should be allowed to employ a Solicitor,
15375
should be on sworn evidence, 15374, 15369-79

BALLYMACARRETT ROAD NATIONAL SCHOOL :

Absence of principal teacher on deputation, on
occasion of inspector's visit, explanation,
15193-5
nothing Contributed to upkeep by manager
15471-81
Desks, provision of, particulars and investigation,
15166
Inaccuracy of Mr. Houson in marking a subject
not taught, 15681-6
Inadequacy of building, 15691-3
Inspection, owing to examination having taken
place early in uniform school year, 15139-43
Mark lowered on account of pressure, 15697-166
Overcrowding and attendance reduced by order
of National Board, 14940-6, 15432-514,
15634-9
Ownership question, 15692-3
Statement that one lady teacher had charge of
150 pupils in attendance inaccurate, 15314-31
Statement re, put in report of Belfast Depu-
tation, paragraphs left out, 15550-3
Statement made by Mr. Houson re, should have
been put in Observation book, 15435-41,
15656-65
Teacher accused of altering Observation book,
15645-50

BELFAST CIRCULAR :

Action ultimately taken on own initiative,
15416-12, 15383-4
Appeal, interpretation of right to as teachers in
evidence, 15374-97
Chief inspectors' re-inspection looked upon as
farce by teachers 15325-66
Deputation :
Date of beginning of movement 15663-4
Inspectors present at, and had privilege of
asking questions, 15375-80
Observations made on teachers, teachers
should have been given opportunity of
replying, 15381-91
Received by Resident Commissioner on Feb.
6th, 1911, 14048
Equipment and state of building has led to
lowering of mark, 15088-124
Fall in marking considered due to secret in-
structions to inspectors from Board, 15015-26,
15957-9, 15673-83

Todd, Charles H.—continued.

Belfast Circuit—continued.

Ground of complaint, rapid and sudden lowering
of marks in 1906, increment and promotion
stopped, and examples, 14955-62, 14972-15014
15028-31, 15218-311, 15461-4, 15465-7
Mr. Hynes considered root of evil, but not opinion
personally, 15021-8
Inquiries having arisen from examination taking
place in uniform school year, 15126-6,
15139-43
Leniency of marking prior to 1900, because
programme was new to teachers, question of,
15032-7
Plan suggested by teachers for re-examination of
schools, 15239-44, 15501-73
Reasons for teachers not accepting Dr. Houson's
offer, 15403-8
Reply to statement of chief inspectors that
teachers would not select number of schools
for examination, 15235
Rise in marking alleged by chief inspectors to
be due to recent appointment of junior
assistant mistresses, and reply, 15232-4
Schools :
Catholic, more than sufficient accommoda-
tion in, 15541-5
47 per cent. reduced, 14933-8
Lack of accommodation in, and School Atten-
dance Act therefore of very little use, 15312-
45, 15397-9
Ownership of teachers, question, 15584-81

Teachers :

Chief inspectors' views as to efficiency, 15274-7
Had considered necessity for making
representations about grievances for some
time, 14949-50
Great many more reductions than statistics
showed known of where teachers refused to
sign because they thought they would be
penalised afterwards, 14967-8
Regarded as cream of profession some years
ago, and due to fact that owing to greater
attractiveness of salaries used to draw men
from all parts of Ireland, 15073-87
Board, Resident Commissioner, fall in marking
of Belfast, considered due to secret instructions
from, and suggested reason, 15057-9, 15673-83
Documents put on 15413-39
Increment should be annual and automatic,
in absence of any serious dereliction of duty
or any serious report, 15399-7, 15687, 15688-
96

INSPECTIONS :

Changes frequent, 15443-62
Chief, re-inspection of schools in case of break-
down should not be carried out by, as being
interested in case, 15586-80
Comparative examination advocated, and teaching
experience necessary, 15188-207
Examinations advocated, and combination of
inspection and examination objected to, 15212-
22, 15143-5, 15313-23, 15413-20, 15400-8,
15687.

MEASURES :

Abolition and substitution of general report on
school advocated, 15393-7, 15687
Lowered by condition of schools and by equipment
and profit, 15088-124, 15385-9, 15450-2
Tone circular, 15504-6
Uniformity, question, 15312

COMPARISONS :

Exact copy by carbon paper, one to be left in
school, and one sent to Board would satisfy
teachers, 15433-41
Main use for succeeding inspector, but inspector
should make report on what he finds in school,
and not what was previously put in, 15432
Suggestions of very little use or consequence to
teachers, 15429-31
Primary Education, comparison of standard with
that under Results system, 15145-57, 15398-9,
15696-12
Pupils, promotion of, proportion kept in same
standard over two years, question, 15427-8
Salaries, instances of loss to teachers by change in
system, 15126-33

Todd, Charles H.—continued.

SCHOOL PROGRAMME:

- Essential subjects should be taught in every school with liberty to teachers and managers to take other subjects suited to requirements of locality .. 15348-64
- Provision re introduction of modified, a dead letter and reasons, .. 15158-58
- Science:
 - Objection to .. 15339-47
 - Possibility of tracing effectually, question, .. 15443-70

SCHOOL YEAR:

- Separate for each school, advocated as affecting examination, .. 15316-31, 15345, 15637
- Uniform, injustice in marking, arising from examination taking place early in, .. 15125-4, 15139-43, 15175-7, 15417-9.

TEACHERS:

- in Belfast, drawn from all parts of Ireland, .. 15073-87, 15293
- Criticised by inspectors for want of preparation for lessons, .. 15223-7
- Extracts only of reports sent to, .. 15442-7
- should get notice of formal visits of inspectors, .. 15314-22, 15413, 15637.
- Funds raised by, for upkeep of schools, .. 15471-81, 15545-50
- Tone and manner of inspectors towards, .. 15637-56, 15111-3, 15178-81

Trill, Dr.:

- Address at Marlboro' Street Training College referred to, *Maken*, .. 23223
- Publicly condemned "Tone" circular in 1911, and was since resigned, *Maken*, .. 22637-40

Tullycavy School:

- no inspection held in 1910, and question, *Anderson*, .. 18261-16, 18269-72
- Merit Marks awarded to, particulars, *Anderson*, .. 18273-93, 18073-90, 18236-40
- Small schools amalgamated with, *Anderson*, .. 15122-34

Tycnought School:

- Appeal for re-examination in Irish, particulars, *Cahill*, .. 17370-97
- Record under Results System, *Cahill*, .. 17613
- Record from 1901-1907, *Cahill*, .. 17814-33, 17797
- Size, *Cahill*, .. 17506-8

W.

Walsh, Mr., dismissal, particulars, *MacSwamy*, .. 22166-75

Ward, Philip:

- Appointment as Commissioner and minor concessions won through influence of, *Maken*, .. 23431-3
- Statement of Mr. DeWorth that appointment would give teachers additional means of access to Board, reply to, *Maken*, .. 22547
- Waterford Congress, protest against refusal of access to Board, *Maken*, .. 23322

Wolpy, W. H.:

- would base opinion on percentage of passes in arithmetic, *Owens*, .. 19209
- Board aware before dismissal of Mr. Mansfield that he was marking more severely than Mr. Brown in Clonmel, *Dessie*, .. 22446-72
- Correspondence with Mr. Mansfield re notice of closing of school, particulars, *Mansfield*, .. 21239-46, 21339-70
- Complaints of general discontent among teachers first heard at meeting at Thurles, *Mansfield*, .. 21300-9

Wolpy, W. H.—continued.

- Criticism of, in speech made by Mr. Mansfield at Clonmel, particulars, *Mansfield*, .. 21799, 21804-11, 21813, 21833-60, 21891-8
- Difference in methods from other inspectors, *O'Gorman*, .. 15939-42
- Discourtesy, *Barry*, .. 20484-6
- Exhaustive examination by, *Owens*, .. 18648-8
- Explanation of leaving out reference to, in appeal, *Mansfield*, .. 21424-8
- Influence over junior inspectors, question of, *Garry*, .. 19583-7
- Influence over junior inspectors, and questions from, should not carry weight, *Mansfield*, .. 21429
- Letter from teachers to Board suggesting transfer of, to vacancy left by promotion of Mr. MacNeill, *Mansfield*, .. 21332-61
- Manner, *Barry*, .. 20621, 20530-34
- Mark in 4 out of 6 schools in Clonmel circuit raised by Mr. Hynes, *Keegan*, .. 20297-8
- Mark given to Loughmore School lowered by Mr. Hynes, and particulars, *Nash*, .. 20238-41, 20245, 20271-301
- Marking and reports:
 - Ballymore School, *Maker*, .. 20743.
 - Callan School, *Mansfield*, .. 21149-88, 21196-9, 21217-8, 21246-69, 21293-308
 - Glennahoe School, *Leaky*, .. 20500, 20501-4.
 - Gortagowna School, particulars, *Fegarty*, .. 19550-462.
 - Kilbane Boys' School, *O'Gorman*, .. 18711-38, 18746-57, 18761-2, 18815-35, 18890-93, 18906-35.
 - Lowtown Boys' School, *Galbally*, *Owens*, .. 18253-70, 18390, 18657-9, 18670-85.
 - Mardryke School, *Swamy*, .. 19397-604, 19433, 19550, 19453-5, 19458-62, 19464, 19489-3, 19713-8, 19720-40.
 - Mohober School, particulars, *O'Mahony*, .. 18071-98, 19030-3, 19043-83, 19068-71, 19085-101, 19126-8, 19133-50.
 - Monard Boys' School, *O'Donnell*, .. 19781-5, 19821-54.
 - Mayeskey School, *Maker*, .. 20729-31.
 - Rathgarmock School, *Garry*, .. 19467, 19486-518, 19533-62, 19568-73.
 - Rathkeerin School, *Owens*, .. 20364-8, 20374-82, 20391-3, 20412-7, 20418-23, 20435-38, 20444-8, 20450-9.
 - Roscrea School, *Owens*, .. 19182-200.
 - Rosgreen School, *Keegan*, .. 20425-6, 20433-4.
 - St. James' School, Belfast, *Larmer*, .. 16560, 16793.
 - Sherrardagh Boys' School, *Barry*, .. 20535-59, 20571-2, 20573.
 - Sherrardagh Girls' School, *Barry*, .. 20467-8, 20471, 20473-82, 20508, 20516-20.
 - Templemore School, *O'Grady*, .. 19893-6, 19903-45, 19969, 19969-85.
 - Observations in Mohober School Observation Book by Mr. Fitzgerald contradicting statement of, *O'Mahony*, .. 19338-42
 - Privileged letter to Board stating that opinion of teachers was that he was qualifying for Chief Inspectorship, unfavourable on part of Mr. Hynes, and particulars, *Mansfield*, .. 21430-41
 - Ran counter to spirit and instructions of office, *Mansfield*, .. 21793-3
 - Remarks in Observation Book of St. James School, Belfast, and reply to, *Larmer*, .. 16703, 16727, 16806-5
 - should be removed from circuit 13, otherwise friction will continue, *Mansfield*, .. 21789
 - Reply to statement that advice tendered to teachers is persistently disregarded, *Keegan*, .. 20092-6
 - Report put in Observation Book of Killymore School, *O'Flanagan*, .. 20015-3, 20019, 20031-6
 - Reprimand of teacher of Rosgreen School on report of, particulars, and withdrawal, *Keegan*, .. 20124-34, 20175-86, 20237-38
 - had Resident Commissioner at his back, *Mansfield*, .. 21739-1
 - Statement that managers did not interfere in Clonmel case inaccurate, *Mansfield*, .. 21428
 - Statement that Tipperary teachers were not prepared to give a fair trial to, refuted, *Mansfield*, .. 21441
 - Steps taken to prepare memorial to Board re marking of, particulars, *Mansfield*, .. 21310

Welby, W. H.—*continued*.

Story of deputation of teachers to managers in
Gloucestal circuit groundless, *Keppon*, 20082
Table given by, re firing of teachers, particulars,
Massfield, 21445-46
Teachers in Gloucestal circuit entitled to redress
from severe marking of, and question, *Gulley*,
18674-8
no useful suggestions made by, *Quinn*, 20372, 20374

Whelan, Mrs., dismissal, particulars, *MacSweeney*,
22196-7

Wicklow Teachers, agitation re Rule 127 (b), and
managers memorialised, *MacSweeney*, 21981-92

Wicklow Teachers' Organisation, resolution re
dismissals forwarded to Commissioners, *MacSweeney*
22049

Wolfe, Mr., dismissal, particulars, *MacSweeney*,
22165-75

Writing, *see* under School Programme.

Wyse, Mr. :

Letters to Belfast Teachers' Association, *Larwood*,
16709, 16710, 16711.
marking of Blessington Boys' School, *Landers*, 21975

Y.

Yates, J. :

Marking of:
Gorlagowna School, *Fegarty*, 19338-49, 19351,
19395, 19397-9.
Kilnasave School, *O'Flanagan*, 19999, 20002-3,
20019, 20026-8, 20054-61.
Standard far more strict since advent of Mr.
Welby, *O'Flanagan*, 20068-70.

G